THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXV, No. 5 NOVEMBER, 1956

CONTENTS

An Initial Problem in Ecclesiology. *David Granfield, O.S.B.* 289
The Time of Administration of Extreme Unction *J. Richard Quinn* 292
A Marian Retreat for Men. . . . *Bernard J. LeFrois, S.V.D.* 300
Hypnosis and Moral Theology. . . . . *John Fearon, O.P.* 309
Seminary Study of American Protestantism *Kenneth Dougherty, S.A.* 313
Intellectual Standards Among American Catholics *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 323

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm., and and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Communion Call Procedure. 337
Imperata at Sunday High Mass. 337
Nuptial Blessing Outside of Mass. 338
Distribution of Holy Communion. 338
Proper Color. 338
Mass Facing Congregation. 339
Commemoration at High Mass. 340
Silver Wedding Anniversary Celebration. 340
Dominican Blessing of Rosaries. 340

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter. November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1956, by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Preceding Page*)

Lighting of Easter Candle 341
Nuptial Blessing 341
The *Missa pro populo* by the Pastor of a National Parish ... 342
A Problem in Courtship 343
The Preservation of Altar Breads 343
Baptism of Offspring from an Invalid Marriage 345
Plane Travellers and Confession 346
Spiritual Directors for Religious 347
The Rights of a Religious to Confess 347

ANALECTA

Review of Recent Doman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 349

BOOK REVIEWS

All or Nothing, *by Murray Ballantyne* 353
The Mind of the Church in the Formation of Sisters, *by Sister Rita Mary, C.H.M.* 355
They Saw His Glory, *by Maisie Ward* 357
Neglected Saints, *by E. I. Watkin* 359

***Time to think about* CHRISTMAS!**

Why not give a year's subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review?*

★To—Your Priest Friends ★The Newly Ordained ★Seminarians

Twelve times a year your thoughtful gift will bring renewed spiritual and intellectual inspiration, with gratitude for the giver.
A gift card will be sent on your directive.
Don't wait. Make up your list today.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
The Catholic University of America Press
Washington 17, D. C.

Gentlemen: Please send gift subscription to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

City.....**Zone**.....**State**.....

I enclose my check for $.....

United States, Canada and Foreign $5.00
Special Seminarian Rate $3.50

List additional names on separate sheet.

AN INITIAL PROBLEM IN ECCLESIOLOGY

To teach *De Ecclesia* properly it is not sufficient merely to unfold its scientific formulations.[1] Logical analysis is not enough if the mind is to be led to a richly balanced grasp of this harmony of truths which is the study of the Catholic Church. A pedagogical or psychological approach is requisite to attain that contemplative union with truth which is the perfection of science.

Just as a metaphysician must have an intuition of being or his *habitus scientiae* is but a logically organized mnemonic *tour de force;* so, too, an ecclesiologist must have a grasp of the Church as a living whole or his competence is that of a blind man lost on the by-roads of analysis, unable to see the splendor of the City of God.

A theologian studies the whole Christ, the *totus Christus,* Head and Body. Underlying this dual consideration is a parallel need. Thus, to prepare for Christology, he should have experienced, almost as an eye-witness, something of the wisdom, holiness and power of this majestic being, the God-man who dwelt among us. Only then will systematic study achieve its purpose, a deeper penetration into the mystery itself. Until contact is made with the living reality, one can *know things about Christ,* but one does not really *know Christ.* Similarly, to prepare for ecclesiology, one should have seen and marvelled at the Church freshly born from the side of Christ, as it is portrayed in the Acts of the Apostles. It often comes as a "revelation" to many, even to priests long past their seminary days, to read through the Acts with the express intention of seeing the Church in its primitive purity. The rhetorical impact of the early Church is undeniable, for it has all its essential elements plus the beauty and enthusiasm of youth, and, most important of all, its identity with the same true Church of Christ which is known today as the Roman Catholic.

The presentation of the object of the science as something in the real world and not just as a set of propositions in the sphere of

[1] Two very recent manuals are the strictly logical and analytical type: *De Ecclesia Christi* by Salaverri, S.J., in the *Sacrae Theologiae Summa,* Vol. I; and another by the same title by Joseph Mors, S.J., in his *Theologia Fundamentalis,* Vol. II.

ideas is not the only advantage accruing from the initial consideration of the Acts in the study of the Church. Intellectually, there is great stimulation in the challenge to find out as much as possible about the Church, while sticking exclusively to the facts recorded by St. Luke. To examine his account without any preconceived notions or presuppositions—except, perhaps, the necessary one that this account is absolutely accurate and inspired—is to bring one's mind into precise accord with the deposit of faith. We begin to see what kind of an organization it is, its rulers and their power, its purposes and claims, its structure and membership, and lastly, its opponents. No longer is there the uneasy feeling that the word of God is being forced into artificial categories, but rather the comforting realization that the divisions and classifications are in line with the nature of the Church itself.

After coming face to face with the Church, and after discovering and organizing the basic ecclesiastical elements, one turns to the Gospels, not because they are the subject matter of the next thesis, but because the mind hungers for a sufficient reason for the vitality and structural stability and confidence of the primitive Church which, immediately on Christ's Ascension into Heaven, appears to the world as an established institution, a *fait accompli.* We look to the Gospels for the explanation and the significance of what we have seen in the Acts. Grasped in its full context like this the convincing power of the scriptural proofs concerning the Church is immense.

Still seeking out the full implications of the Acts, the mind acquires through familiarization rather than memorization a sound scriptural sense and textual efficiency, simply because its search leads it through the whole of Scripture for it all treats in some way of the Church of Christ. After moving to the Gospels to find the sufficient reason for the Church of the Acts in the words of Christ, we wind our way through the Old Testament to grasp the full continuity in the development of the Kingdom of God. In fact, many passages in the Acts, especially the discourse of St. Stephen, prompt us to seek out the roots of the Church in the pre-Christian past. Though we have reached one pole, the beginning, we must keep on the move, this time in the other direction through the inspired commentaries, the Epistles, to the portrayal of the Church triumphant in the pages of the Apocalypse. This project sounds overly ambitious, so it is well to qualify it. There is no need or

justification in making the course on Holy Scripture the first part of the course on the Church, but there is a real necessity that the significance and relationship of the parts of the Bible to the Church itself should be pointed out, so that when biblical studies are undertaken they can be integrated with ecclesiology to the mutual benefit of both courses.

The emphasis on the full sweep of scripture, which a detailed study of the Acts leads to, implies another advantage, one which Monsignor Fenton calls, "The Church in Adequate Perspective."[2] The tendency in ecclesiology, he rightly insists, is to concentrate on one or two of the dimensions of the Church without treating the others at all, or without treating them sufficiently. Yet if one examines the Acts intelligently one finds, even in this short report, the Church in its true proportions. The vertical dimension is seen in Christ, the Son of God and acknowledged founder of the Church, Who works through the Apostles. Horizontally, there is the line back to the Old Testament and forward to the Apocalypse. Lastly, pointing down to the depths of Hell, we find the adversary, "the prince of this world,"[3] persecuting the Church of Christ, and commanding, in a losing battle, what St. Peter referred to as "this perverse generation."[4] A thorough study of the Acts will be the guarantee that the theologian will have enlarged his vision of the Church in such a way as to encompass its full magnitude.

Briefly, then, the suggested examination of the Acts of the Apostles will prepare the theologian both scripturally and rationally for the technical theological formulation of the science of ecclesiology. It will open his mind to the riches of the word of God and will fill his mind with the right questions as to how this divine light can be grasped through human intelligence. Thus both faith and reason will serve to disclose the full beauty of the Bride of Christ, the Catholic Church.

DAVID GRANFIELD, O.S.B.

St. Anselm's Priory
Washington, D. C.

[2] *AER*, CXXXIII, 4 (Oct. 1955), 258-74.
[3] *John* 14:30.
[4] *Acts* 2:40.

THE TIME OF ADMINISTRATION OF EXTREME UNCTION

The scope of this discussion is limited to two points: the proper time for the administration of Extreme Unction and the question of the repetition of the sacrament.[1] With regard to the first point, a further restriction has been made to that requirement on the part of the subject which deals with his being in danger of death from sickness. There are, indeed, many points worthy of comment connected with the other necessary conditions for the reception of this sacrament but their omission has been dictated by the time allotted. It was thought that the two points treated here very frequently form the basis of difficulties which are experienced by the ministers of Extreme Unction. The purpose of the paper is the hope that through the discussion which it may encourage, help may be rendered to priests who are called upon to determine when a patient should be anointed.

At the outset a word should be said regarding the nature of these remarks. They are not intended as a solution to the questions which they touch, but rather to suggest thoughts for discussion. The desired purpose will have been attained if these observations lead others to express their thinking on these matters so that ultimately it may be possible to form some practical guides for priests who administer Extreme Unction.

The suggestion has been made in recent years that we do not administer Extreme Unction as early as we might and that this practice is detrimental to the spiritual and corporal good of the sick.[2] One of the most complete expositions of this plea for earlier anointing appeared in an article signed by F. Meurant.[3] Because what this writer has to say may serve as a basis for discussion, the following summary of the article is given.

[1] These remarks were presented as the basis of discussion at the regional meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America which was held at Weston College, Weston, Mass., on Dec. 30, 1955.

[2] Cf. A. M. Roguet, *Christ Acts Through the Sacraments* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1954), pp. 101-11.

[3] Cf. *La vie spirituelle* (Mar. 1955), pp. 242-51.

It is the thesis of Meurant that a three-fold error has made of Extreme Unction a sacrament of the last illness, a sacrament of the dying rather than, what it should be, a sacrament of the sick. The error is theological, liturgical, and psychological.

From the viewpoint of theology the principal object of Extreme Unction is a spiritual purification, complementary to Penance, which effaces or diminishes the last remains of sin. The effect of this purification is a grace of spiritual comfort, and, secondarily, of corporal comfort. In order that the sacrament be administered it is required that the patient be gravely sick or in danger of death. This implies that he has as many chances of recovery as of death. If it is the will of God the patient can recover his health by means of the sacrament. The writer points out that if Extreme Unction is considered as the sacrament of the dying, the patient who recovers has received the sacrament unduly and inefficaciously, which conclusion is opposed to theological teaching.

Meurant goes on to say that if Extreme Unction has as its proper effect a grace comforting against the difficulties of death, it should be administered to those condemned to death, martyrs, and the like. If the reason alleged against such an administration is that such people are not sick, it follows that the sacrament is given to the sick inasmuch as they are sick and not inasmuch as they are dying and that it is meant to help them in the trial of their sickness, not in the trial of their death.

Liturgically the practice of delaying anointing is incorrect in view of the fact that the prayers of the *Ritual* ask for the restoration of health. These prayers, the writer says, are without meaning, ironic and hypocritical if it must be assumed that the patient will soon die.

Psychologically the making of Extreme Unction the sacrament of the last illness underestimates the trial of sickness and seems to ignore the moral agony which this trial entails. There is often a moral agony, even in the case of a curable patient, which is like the agony of Christ in the garden. Sometimes this moral agony is more painful than the last agony which is not experienced when death is swift, when the patient is unconscious, or when he has surmounted the terrors of death by supernatural means. The writer thinks it significant that the angel was sent to Our Lord in the garden, rather than on the cross.

This triple error has made of Extreme Unction the sacrament of the last illness when it should be the sacrament of every grave illness. It should give the patient, for the whole time of his trial, a spiritual comfort and, secondarily, a corporal one. It is only as a consequence and eventually that the sacrament should obtain the grace of a good death by continuing to act until that decisive moment.

To the objection that too early anointing might place the sick man in the position of committing faults after reception of the sacrament the writer asks whether he would not in fact commit fewer and lesser sins if he is anointed than if he is not given the sacrament until a later time.

The touchstone of the matter, Meurant confesses, is the determination of the limits within which Extreme Unction may be administered. In this connection he suggests that we may profit from medical progress in deciding more precisely what is involved in the terms "danger of death" and "grave illness." It is suggested that we may speak of a "profound state" in opposition to a "superficial state." A true sickness is a profound state which affects the whole organism in a sensible way and manifests itself by symptoms which are general and accentuated, such as a fever to a certain degree. A superficial state is a simple indisposition which remains localized, even though the whole organism reacts to it. The example is given of a head cold which is an indisposition in contrast to a pulmonary congestion which is profound and presents a certain danger of death by the very fact that it is profound. Even though such a sickness is very possibly curable, as long as it is a real illness, it justifies Extreme Unction. Medicine will be able in most cases to diagnose a profound state by means of radioscopic examination of organs and microscopic examination of blood and tissue.

Speaking of the long-term illnesses such as tuberculosis, cancer, and heart ailments, the writer says that victims of these diseases should be given Extreme Unction as soon as the illness has attained a state at which it affects the whole organism profoundly because then the danger of death exists, in spite of the progress of medical science. If the illness will be of long duration following the anointing there is all the more reason for administering the sacrament

because the patient needs an exceptional help to face this exceptional trial.

In conclusion, the writer draws a parallel between the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist and that of Extreme Unction. The decrees of Pope Saint Pius X and Pope Pius XII have corrected errors in practice regarding the Eucharist. Meurant suggests that the phrase "danger of death" is merely disciplinary, inserted to avoid abuses which formerly existed, and states his opinion that the Pope could mitigate this condition and make Extreme Unction the sacrament of all serious illnesses and, in the first place, of those which are curable. It is custom, not liturgy or doctrine, which needs reform in this matter.

Soon after the appearance of the article by Meurant there appeared a comment on it in an English clerical review.[4] This points out that the farther the administration of Extreme Unction is removed from the moment of death the less effectively it produces its proper effect of preparing the way for prompt entry into glory because of the faults committed daily. For this reason moralists have required a proximate danger of death for its lawful administration. The commentator goes on to say that this insistence is not so clearly asserted in the positive law. Trent teaches that the sacrament is to be administered especially to those in proximate danger of death, not only to such; and the Code requires only the prudent judgment that the danger be real. Again, it is said, not all moralists stress the proximity of danger. These writers leave the decision to the prudent judgment of the priest. The conclusion presented is that "it is a question of balancing the sustaining effect of the sacrament against what we may call its final cleansing effect." In closing, the writer speaks of the evident advantages of a later anointing, provided it is not too late for the co-operation of the subject.

The question of the repetition of Extreme Unction is one about which much has been written. Because, however, there are still practical instances in which the priest is puzzled as to the proper procedure it may not be without profit to draw attention to certain aspects of the repetition of this sacrament. There is room for discussion regarding the obligation of repeating the sacrament and the degree of this obligation as well as its possibility in some cases.

[4] Cf. *The Clergy Review* (Aug. 1955), pp. 489-92.

With regard to the case in which there is a new danger of death in the same illness we do not find absolute agreement among those who write on the matter. Noldin, for instance, states that in this case we may anoint and contrasts this situation to that in which there is a new illness and a new danger, in which case one must anoint.[5] Kilker finds this distinction inadmissible. "Either the man is in need of the efficacy of the sacrament or he is not. If he is, then the sacrament must be repeated; if he is not, why anoint him."[6]

The question of a second anointing in the case in which the patient is never totally out of danger is most perplexing. Authors refer to a "morally new danger" justifying repetition. Kilker describes this as a situation in which *de facto* the danger was never totally removed but where a partial recuperation is considered as "a successful negotiation of the situation."[7] He quotes Genicot as saying that in this situation popular belief is to be preferred to competent medical opinion to the contrary, but indicates the possibility that this statement is too broad. P. O'Neill is of the opinion that the validity of the sacrament does not depend, in such circumstances, on the objective fact of a new danger distinct from the previous one, but rather "it depends on the prudent judgment that such is the case."[8] The minister, he says, is not expected to be infallible in his judgment considering the patient's condition and although frequently a person is anointed who is out of danger, "it could not be held that in every such instance the Sacrament is invalid."

We hear frequent reference to the so-called "one month rule." It must be borne in mind that this applies only to the case in which there is doubt as to the presence of a new danger. It does not apply to the case in which it is certain that the patient has not recovered at all. Kilker says, "A patient, once anointed, who lingers on for months and months, sinking slowly, but perceptibly all the time, is not a lawful subject for readministration."[9] It cannot be said, therefore, that it is always lawful to repeat Extreme

[5] Cf. *Summa theologiae moralis* (Barcelona: Editorial Herder, 1951), n. 448.

[6] "The Repetition of Extreme Unction," *AER* (Jan. 1932), p. 48.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[8] *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (Dec. 1933), p. 634.

[9] *Op. cit.*, pp. 52-53.

Unction once a month to chronic invalids. McCarthy puts it plainly, "This rule is to be applied only to cases which are doubtful. It may not be erected into a universal principle and applied to all cases in which patients are dangerously ill from a lingering illness."[10]

Granting that the "one month rule" does not apply if there has been no improvement at all, the question arises as to whether, in order that one repeat the anointing, there must be some perceptible change for the better, or whether the person who lives a month without showing signs of declining, may be anointed again, at least conditionally. In other words, must there be some positive sign of recovery, even though slight, before one may anoint again? This seems to be McCarthy's opinion, for he says that repetition is forbidden in the case in which there has been no "definite change for the better" even though a month or more has elapsed. He argues that the law and the rubrics require a definite improvement before the sacrament may be repeated. He concludes, "Mere continuance of life, no matter how long, does not suffice."[11] P. O'Neill agrees.[12] Connell quotes Genicot approvingly to the effect that after a year's lapse a priest may anoint again in such a case.[13]

The opposite seems to be the implication of M. J. O'Donnell, who points out that one danger of death may pass and another come within as short a time as an hour in one case and a similar change not take place in a month in another. For this reason the evidence in each individual case must decide the issue. In those circumstances, however, in which "there is no special evidence one way or the other . . . common sense fixes on the period of a month or so as a reasonable standard. It is only a standard . . . an approximation that will give us good results as a whole, but will always yield to evidence, one way or the other, to the contrary."[14]

As a means of justifying the second anointing the suggestion has been made by W. McDonald that perhaps the first anointing in such a case is invalid on the basis that at the time of the first administration the danger of death was not sufficiently proximate.[15]

[10] *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (Apr. 1943), p. 266.
[11] *Ibid.* pp. 265-66.
[12] Cf. *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (Dec. 1930), pp. 639-41.
[13] Cf. *AER* (Sept. 1949), p. 222.
[14] *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (June 1915), p. 636.
[15] Cf. *The Irish Theological Quarterly* (Jan. 1907), p. 54.

This explanation is rejected by P. J. Toner on the grounds that it is against the teaching of the first twelve centuries.[16] M. J. O'Donnell calls the suggestion "ingenious" and asks, "Whether true or false, who can say?"[17]

Another suggested solution was that presented in a communication to an Irish periodical.[18] This draws a distinction between "periculum" in paragraph 1 of Canon 940 and "discrimen" in the second paragraph. According to the correspondent, "periculum" means danger which may last for a long time, whereas "discrimen" may be translated "crisis" or "turning point" which can last only a short time. During one and the same danger of death there may be many turning points. When a person has recovered from one of these turning-points and fallen into another, he may be anointed again, though the danger is continuous all the time. The canon does not necessarily mean that the patient should have recovered so much that he is out of danger. It may be presumed safely that a person does not continue in the same crisis for longer than a month. J. McCarthy answers this query by admitting that linguistically the distinction is not without foundation, but he rejects the interpretation as being opposed to traditional use according to which the two phrases are synonymous. It is McCarthy's opinion also that the suggestion made in the question does not establish the one-month rule since, according to the reasoning of the correspondent, the sacrament should be repeated every time a new crisis was reached and there would be no reason for saying that such a crisis would occur once a month. In this discussion McCarthy makes several observations on the general question of the one month rule which deserve mention. He stresses the fact that there is often undue emphasis on the time element in the question of repeating Extreme Unction. Whenever there is a new and distinct danger of death, the sacrament is to be repeated, no matter how closely it follows a similar such danger. He says of the one month anointing, "This rule is based not upon the certain onset of any new crisis, but upon the presumption that, in the absence of certain evidence to the contrary, a patient who has lived a month is, at least morally, in a new danger of death."

[16] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 247-50.
[17] *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (Dec. 1919), p. 485.
[18] Cf. *ibid.* (Mar. 1951), pp. 245-54.

The question of the obligation to administer Extreme Unction a second time is not one which is treated extensively. F. J. Connell, however, in answering a question dealing with the duty on the part of the subject to receive the sacrament makes the observation that from the fact that there is no grave obligation *per se* on the part of the subject, it does not follow that the priest's obligation is parallel. "He has a duty which is *per se* grave to give Extreme Unction to any one of his flock who reasonably requests it, even though the person himself has no strict obligation to receive it."[19]

In connection with the case in which a second danger comes from a different source while the first danger persists, Kilker makes the following distinction: if the second danger is closely connected with the first "so that by its very nature it is ordinarily concomitant with or consequent to the first danger," it should be treated as the same sickness; but if the second is independent of the first "and is of sufficient gravity to put a man in peril even if the first were not present, the sacrament may be repeated."[20] Others deny the permissibility of reanointing on the grounds that such patients do not fall into a different danger of death but the danger already present is intensified by a new cause. While he admits the probability of both opinions, Kilker himself inclines to the first, that in favor of repetition although he says no obligation can be placed on the priest to reanoint in such a case.

There is room for considerable discussion concerning the question of the time for the administration of the sacrament of Extreme Unction. The present writer hopes that these few observations may prompt comment to which we may look for greater clarity of thought on the matter. Since it is a subject which is not usually treated at great length in books of theology, perhaps the most efficient means of increasing our knowledge of it is through discussion in theological periodicals.

J. Richard Quinn

St. John's Seminary
Brighton, Mass.

[19] *AER* (Feb. 1953), p. 146.
[20] *Op. cit.*, pp. 53-54.

A MARIAN RETREAT FOR MEN

A few years ago, the summer week-end retreats for men were assigned to me. They begin Friday evening and last until Sunday mid-afternoon, closing with renewal of baptismal vows before the Blessed Sacrament exposed. As it was the Marian year of 1954, it seemed to me that a Marian retreat was in order, although I had some misgivings at the outset whether the generality of men would take to a retreat built up exclusively on the great Marian truths. The fact that every one of the groups did so with enthusiasm is just another proof how shortsighted one can be not to be willing to integrate the great Marian truths into the everyday lives of our Catholic men. According to the express Will of God, that is where they belong. For the benefit of those fellow-priests who are interested in knowing the method used in giving Marian retreats the following brief explanation is offered.

From Friday night to Sunday mid-afternoon there was need of only seven conferences, including the Introductory conference. One hour of questions and answers and a slide lecture on the Holy Land took the place of two others. I selected seven major factors or truths in Mary's personality which I considered would have the greatest bearing on the lives of the retreatants. Each conference was to have first of all a theological basis, popular theology of course, namely, a clear explanation of what the Marian prerogative in question consists in, for it is often this doctrinal angle that our Catholic laymen are anxious to know more about, provided it is presented in non-technical language. On this theoolgical basis a practical integration of that given Marian truth was followed through, not always in the same manner, but accordingly as the theme lent itself for development.

MARY'S LIVING FAITH

In the opening conference on Friday night, after the usual pointers and suggestions, I launched into the subject of Mary's great faith. First and foremost of our race Mary takes the lead in *believing* God's message concerning the Incarnate Son of God, made known to her by the Angel (*Luke* 1:26). She joyfully co-operates

with God's plan by receiving His Divine Son wholeheartedly; and the fairest flower of mankind becomes Mother of God and the most intimate companion of His Christ, inseparably one with Him in all things thenceforth. That is the setting for the entire retreat. Christian faith is acceptance of God's revelation concerning His Son. Receiving Christ wholeheartedly is but repeating what Mary has done in our name and in our stead. "Christ in us," the great Pauline mystery, is but an extension of the mystery of the Incarnation: "Christ in Mary." It remains, that we become Christ's intimate companions and, like Mary, bring forth Christ (spiritually) in our hearts. Fundamental in this spiritual transformation is the divine virtue of faith. Union with Christ will grow apace in accordance with the Marian faith manifested. An apt illustration is the parable of the sower (*Matt.* 13) where the various kinds of soil represent the receptivity of the human heart to receive the Word of God and produce abundant fruit. Mary's heart is that perfect soil that produced one hundredfold.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

Mary's Immaculate Conception offers a fine opening for the morning conference. It brings up the subject of original sin and the world's attitude toward it: either complete disregard and denial of it, or false and pessimistic over-emphasis of its effects with resultant hopelessness and despair. The Catholic attitude stresses the fact of fallen nature, acknowledges it to be the explanation for that early wayward trend in everyone, but turns to God and His saving grace as the remedy for all evil. Mary's Immaculate Conception now appears in its best light. It is our human nature fitted out with divine grace from the very start. Favoring Mary with divine grace from the very instant of her conception clearly demonstrates what God really intended and still intends us to be: all-holy like Himself, without the defilements of sin, without the weight and the evil effects of sin, without imperfection, full of light and splendor, a masterpiece of His goodness. Sin is the ruinous work of Satan, God's archenemy. But the work of Satan must be destroyed. Man must become pleasing to God and like unto Him. It is Mary who has been commissioned by God to wage that relentless battle against Satan and sin in the world at large and in every individual soul. Victory was promised the Invincible Woman through her Divine Son, Christ (*Gen.* 3:15). It is Mary who crushes Satan

and untiringly defeats his works of darkness by bringing forth Christ in fulness in the human heart. Battling sin and evil habits on the side of the Invincible Woman, the Immaculate One, gives new motivation and strength to old endeavors. The frequent recitation of the Memorare is a practical conclusion.

PERPETUAL VIRGINITY

The conference on Mary's perpetual virginity starts off with an anecdote. In the old days when the Bessemer railroad was being laid near Erie, Pa., a young Protestant foreman named Young used to enjoy belittling the immigrants who were working under him, their status, their broken English and their religion. One day he approached an Irishman and with his usual sarcasm asked him if his Virgin Mary had had any more children of late. The Irishman was visibly shaken. He flustered a bit, turned slowly around, leaned on his shovel with tears in his eyes. Slowly he found his voice to say: "Mr. Young, you have deeply offended me and one whom I love dearly. Don't ever dare to say that again, else I will not be responsible for what I do to you with this shovel." Young withdrew, impressed. He went home that evening and bought a Catholic catechism. Today you will find a plaque in the sacristy of Erie's Cathedral, dedicated to Bishop Young, first bishop of Erie. The result of the courage of one Irish laborer, defending the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Mother. Mary's perpetual virginity falls under three headings, the well-known *ante partum,* in *partu* and *post partum;* and a brief but clear explanation of each point will now be in order. At this juncture one can add with benefit the difference between the Virgin Birth (of Christ) and the Immaculate Conception (of Mary), for it is an issue often confused by non-Catholics and not too clear to all Catholics. One should point out also how easy it is to refute those time-worn objections made against Mary's perpetual virginity such as the Gospel phrases "brethren of Christ" and "firstborn of Mary" for it is of practical value to the men to have ready answers on these points. The vital meaning of Mary's perpetual virginity for the individual can now be brought out by developing the importance of true chastity in the life of every Christian. First of all, an appreciative word on perpetual chastity and the God-given vocation to the priesthood or religious life. One should never lose the opportunity to speak on the life wholly dedicated to Christ. Then the more practical angle

for the life of every Christian: a review on the habit of chastity and sins against it. Chastity is the habit of *controlling* the sexual appetite according to the dictates of right reason and faith. That appetite is implanted in man's nature by God Himself and hence is something very excellent. Sin enters in only where there is abuse. This opens the way to speak on sins against chastity both for the unmarried and for those in the married state, and a brief but intelligent treatment of this matter even in some detail will surely be appreciated. The Virgin Mother's pure life has always been a powerful help to all classes of men to lead a chaste life, whether married or unmarried. To keep the body holy in order to give honor to Mary's virginal purity is a strong motive, and the habit of turning to her instantly when tempted by the Evil Spirit of impurity will have an enduring effect. When blessing the houses of Catholics in Rome, one will almost always notice the image of the Virgin Mother with the Divine Child placed directly over the marriage bed. It is to serve as a constant reminder!

SPIRITUAL MOTHERHOOD

A truth that needs careful handling is Mary's spiritual motherhood. One ought to dispel any false notions that we are dealing with a sentimental outburst of feminine devotion. That Mary is the Mother of redeemed humanity is Catholic truth, intimately bound up with the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Redemption. The words of recent Pontiffs ought to suffice:

> In the chaste womb of the Virgin when Jesus took mortal flesh, He took to Himself also a spiritual body formed of all those who were to believe in Him. . . . All of us, then, who are united to Christ are, as the Apostle said, "members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones" (*Eph.* 5:30) and should think of ourselves as the fruit of the Virgin's womb, whence we were to issue one day in the likeness of a body attached to its head. It is for this reason that, in a spiritual and mystic sense, we are called the sons of Mary, and that she is, on her side, mother of us all, mother after the Spirit, but the true mother, nevertheless, of all the members of Jesus Christ, that we ourselves are (St. Pius X, *Ad diem illum*).
>
> Within her virginal womb Christ our Lord already bore the exalted title of *Head of the Church;* in a marvellous birth she brought Him forth as *source of all supernatural life.* . . . Free from all sin, original and personal, always most intimately united with her Son, as another

Eve she offered Him on Golgotha to the Eternal Father for all the children of Adam sin-stained by his fall, and her mother's rights and mother's love were included in the holocaust. Thus she who corporally was the Mother of our Head, through the added title of pain and glory became *spiritually the mother of all his members* (Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*).

In detail it should be shown that Mary is mother of men not merely in a figurative sense, as someone is called mother because she displays the qualities of a mother, nor merely in the legal sense as in the case of adopting a child, but in the strict sense of being instrumental in communicating life to men, only it is in the supernatural order and the life is the life of grace. Point out now the difference between the natural and the supernatural order with regard to motherhood and thereby dispel false notions of man's relation to Mary. In the natural order with regard to his physical life man is born a helpless babe, but grows more independent of his mother as life proceeds. That is the normal and correct procedure in nature. In the supernatural order, the opposite holds true. How often Jesus emphasized that truth! He told His hardy fishermen-apostles that unless they were reborn as a child they could not enter God's family (*John* 3:5); they had to become as little children in spirit, else there was no room for them in God's Kingdom (*Matt.* 18:3). The reason is obvious. Those who are closer to God *are in greater dependence* on Him and on His grace, and consequently on His Mother, the Mother and Mediatrix of all graces. The spirit of redeemed humanity was to be the opposite of that of our proud, disobedient first parents. And in order to convince all men, our Saviour took the lead. He could have come as a grown man, powerful and independent, but He came as a helpless child and remained utterly dependent for nine months in Mary's womb, let Himself be fed and clothed and taught for years, and was subject to Mary all during the teenage years and those of early manhood. And He was God! Mankind needed such a supreme divine example of childlike submission. Christ did not disdain to call Himself Son of Mary and be her submissive child for years. Should any man consider himself exempt from doing likewise? There is great strength of character in following Christ in this respect, for such action crushes human pride and begets Christlike humility. Happy the man who has discovered the secret of Mary's spiritual motherhood. In him Christ lives and reigns.

COREDEMPTRIX

A good retreat includes a good retreat-confession. Its purpose is not to cause anxiety over the past but to instill deeper sorrow for sin with definite resolution of amendment. This purpose can be well attained by calling to mind what sin has done to the suffering Redeemer on Golgotha and to Mary, our Coredemptrix. No son can remain unmoved when he considers the pains his own birth has caused his mother. In a remote way, Mary became our Coredemptrix already in the Incarnation, for Christ took upon Himself a human body with all its sufferings in order to redeem us and atone for our sins. Mary agreed wholeheartedly to be mother of just such a suffering Redeemer, hence already in the Incarnation Mary co-operated in our redemption. At the cross, the Saviour consummated His work of redemption amid great sufferings. He gave Himself up entirely as our Sacrifice to the Father. But Mary is there too: "With her suffering and dying Son, Mary endured suffering and almost death. She gave up her mother's right over her Son to procure the salvation of mankind; and to appease the divine justice, she, as much as she could, immolated her Son, so that one can truly affirm that together with Christ she has redeemed the human race" (Benedict XV). Hence not only remotely in the Incarnation, but also proximately and immediately in the very act of the Redemption on Golgotha, Mary is our Coredemptrix. Not that the price paid by Christ was not sufficient. It was all-sufficient. But God willed to accept Mary's offering as part of the price, even though that of the Son was all-sufficient.

The realization of what Mary underwent for us in union with her dying Son gives a person a great distaste for sin, the cause of all their suffering. At this juncture it will prove beneficial to add an examination of conscience with regard to practical topics. Chastity has been treated in a previous conference, but reverence of God, temperance, justice, charity towards one's neighbors and other captions offer good material. It is an opportune moment to correct false or lax notions, to emphasize the guilt and responsibility in certain actions, and to show the need of sincerity with oneself and with God. A concluding word on the consoling doctrine of reparation is encouraging. Christ really repaired our wrongdoings. He offered infinite reparation to the Father for us, making

up for all our sins and shortcomings. Mary, likewise, in the name of everyone of her children offered most pleasing reparation, and her Immaculate Heart never ceases to do so. Sorrow for sin should imbue a man with that same spirit of reparation. Through Christ and with Mary he *can repair* the past. In the holy Sacrifice of the Mass, let him daily offer to God that infinite reparation of the Victim Lamb of God in union with the Virgin Mother. Let him learn from Jesus and Mary the meaning of redemptive suffering.

THE ASSUMPTION

With great foresight Pope Pius XII defined the Assumption of our Lady in 1950. When the whole world was confused as to the purpose of man on earth, uncertain of the future in an atomic age and tense with the anxiety of another possible war, the Holy Father directed the minds and hearts of men to their real goal beyond the eternal shores. He showed them the glory and bliss which their common Mother had attained, a reminder and an assurance of what they also were destined to attain. He declared it to be a revealed truth, entrusted by Christ to His Church, that when the earthly span of Mary's life had come to an end, she was taken up to heaven, *body and soul,* glorious and immortal. Why were there dissident voices among some of the other Christian bodies? Does not the Scripture clearly state that the just shall rise again, even with their bodies, glorious and immortal? (*John* 5:28; *I Cor.* 15:35-43.) Does not every true Christian believe this? Is it so unacceptable that Christ simply *anticipated the time* of its accomplishment for His own holy Mother who had been His most intimate companion all during life? For the generality of men the final victory over sin and death will be on the Last Day, but for His Immaculate Mother who knew no least sin, Christ willed to accomplish it at once, so that the holy Ark of Covenant in which He had dwelt would never taste corruption. Mary's Assumption shines like a beacon to those still detained on the tempestuous sea of life. Death is certain. It may be sudden: a heart attack, a train wreck, an auto accident, a plane crush. Who is better prepared than he who keeps his eye consistently on the goal? And does not every Hail Mary carry with it a petition for Mary's assistance at the hour of death? Mary obtains for her own the precious grace of living always in the grace of God, by

having them say frequently an act of perfect contrition or one of perfect love of God. Then death can come in any form, at any time. The gates of Hell will not prevail, for again the Woman has conquered, this time in a faithful son, another Christ. And on the last day his body likewise shall share that bliss and glory of which Mary's Assumption is the pledge.

MARY'S QUEENSHIP

With peculiar joy Pope Pius XII established the Feast of Mary's Queenship at the climax of the Marian Year. On every possible occasion, the Holy Father has manifested his great love for Mary, realizing as he does the true dignity of God's Mother and the role that God wills her to play in the lives and destinies of men. No one following his guidance will stray from the true path that leads to Light and Peace. The Queenship of Mary was another of those truths which give strength and courage to the banished children of Eve. Mary is our Queen, not merely in the figurative sense of excelling all others, but in the full meaning of the word: one who possesses sovereign power over her people. They belong to her as her subjects; her authority is unquestioned. In this real meaning of the word we hold that our Blessed Mother is our Queen, the Queen in God's Kingdom. Already in 1946, in his radio message to Fatima, the Holy Father had expressed his conviction on this point:

> Jesus, the Son of God, reflects on His heavenly Mother the glory, the majesty, and the *dominion* of His kingship, for, having been associated to the King of Martyrs in the ineffable work of human Redemption as Mother and Co-operatrix, she remains forever associated to Him, with an almost unlimited power, in the distribution of graces which flow from the Redemption. Jesus is King throughout all eternity by nature and by right of conquest; Mary, through Him, with Him and subordinate to Him, is *Queen of grace, by divine relationship, by right of conquest, and by singular election.* And her kingdom is as vast as that of her Son and God, since nothing is excluded from her dominion.

Our Blessed Lord is King by nature, for He is the God-Man. Mary is Queen by singular divine election: God wanted her to be the consort of His Son. Christ conquered Satan, and we belong to Christ as the fruit of His conquest. Mary is also our Queen by conquest, for she co-operated with the Saviour in redeeming us

from Satan. The Queenship of Mary is in the realm of the supernatural, the realm of grace. This blessed truth ought to influence every individual home, and each individual heart. Men must establish the reign of Jesus and Mary in their homes, in their hearts, in their families, and in their contacts. Then and only then can she establish herself as Queen of Peace. This retreat should not close without a sincere consecration of each individual to Mary, Mother and Queen, and the firm resolve to renew that consecration from time to time. What happiness in eternity, what peace of heart on earth to be conscious of the fact that one is endeavoring at all times to be a loyal son and subject of that most powerful Queen, Mary most holy. Near Jerusalem there is a little town called Ain Karem. There one can visit the tomb of Alphonse Ratisbonne, who was converted by a single smile of the Virgin Mother. On a small slab over the grave there is written in French: "O Mary, be mindful of thy child, who is the sweet and glorious victory of thy love!" May each of us be the gentle and glorious victory of Mary's love!

BERNARD J. LE FROIS, S.V.D.

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Vigan, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

HYPNOSIS AND MORAL THEOLOGY

From the time of Mesmer, flamboyant and peevish, ambitious and unscrupulous, to the present day the use of hypnosis has become progressively more respectable. With the advent of classroom and television demonstrations, public acceptance of hypnotism has swung from superstition and supernaturalism in the general direction of useful scientific fact. However, it cannot be denied that hypnotism still has entertainment value for many. In view of contemporary usage and acceptance, it might prove useful to bring the teaching of moral theology to bear on practical contemporary situations.

The interest of moral theology centers on the hypnotic state, i.e., a state somewhat analogous to sleep which is induced by suggestion and characterized by heightened suggestibility. Although some few theologians uniquivocally reprobated the practice of hypnosis, and others surrounded their qualified approval with lengthy precautions and pessimistic reflections, such men as Merklebach and Prümmer do not hesitate to accept hypnotism as a natural phenomenon and declare that in itself it is a licit human experience. However, as with every legitimate human experience, due attention must be given to the circumstances and purposes surrounding the use of hypnosis.

In the first place there are such psychological circumstances as the opinions of the subject and the bystanders which could lead to scandal and the promotion of superstition. In the second place, there is the matter of the diverse effects of hypnosis which admit of a wide variety of purpose. Hypnosis is intricately involved in the moral and psychological aspects of life. The moralists' fundamental contribution has to do with an evaluation of these circumstances.

Hypnosis is used rather commonly by medical doctors, dentists and psychologists in treating their patients. Psychiatrists and psychologists find it useful because of a heightened facility to recall which is useful in discovering repressed experiences giving rise to conflicts and anxieties. Medical doctors and dentists find it useful in allaying the fears of patients and as a simple type of

anesthesia. Granted the objective liceity of hypnosis and the legitimacy of purpose, from the doctor's point of view the following principle must be considered: ". . . as a private person, the doctor can take no measure or try no course of action without the consent of the patient. The doctor has no other rights or power over the patient than those which the latter gives him, explicitly or implicitly and tacitly."[1] Granted that the patient has with justification given such permission it would seem that the doctor could licitly use hypnosis.

From the patient's point of view, the permission must be justified. "In this discussion the decisive point is the moral licitness of the right a patient has to dispose of himself. . . . The patient, then, has no right to involve his physical or psychic integrity, in medical experiments or research when they entail serious destruction, mutilation, wounds or perils."[2] The following are two examples of this:

> . . . a man cannot perform on himself or allow doctors to perform acts of physical or somatic nature which doubtless relieve heavy physical or psychic burdens or infirmities, but which bring about at the same time permanent abolition or considerable and durable diminuation of his freedom, that is, of his human personality in its typical and characteristic function.
>
> . . . In order to rid himself of repressions, inhibitions or psychic complexes, man is not free to arouse in himself for therapeutic purposes each and every appetite of a sexual order which is being excited or has been excited in his being, appetites whose impure waves flood his unconscious or subconscious mind. He cannot make them the object of his thoughts and fully conscious desires with all the shocks and repercussions such a process entails. . . .[3]

These two examples refer to needless lobotomy and psychoanalysis by a pansexual theorist. In practice hypnosis has none of the effects ascribed to lobotomy. A few questions should determine whether the doctor is a pansexual theorist. The medical and psychological professions have sufficiently respectable status so that a patient could prudently assume that the doctor was a responsible agent.

[1] *Pius XII,* Discourse to the first International Congress on the Histopathology of the Nervous System, Sept. 14, 1952.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.*

If doubts arose in the process of treatment a priest should be consulted.

Hypnotism and suggestion are treated in the standard college course in psychology. Frequently the professor conducts classroom experiments with and demonstrations of such phenomena. Merklebach speaks of scientific investigation as a legitimate use of hypnosis, granted the skill of the hypnotist and the prudent selection of a subject. He does not say the classroom demonstration on the college level is an instance of scientific investigation. However, the techniques and effects of hypnotism are natural phenomena just as much as association and perception. Demonstration is a more effective pedagogical device than simple lecture. Thus it would seem that the scientific interests of college students and the pedagogical requirements of the educational situation would justify such demonstrations. Ordinarily the college authorities would not tolerate abuses, and professors could be assumed to be responsible men.

An interesting question arises as to the morality of the clergy practicing hypnotism. Any priest acquainted with hypnotic phenomena will quickly recognize its utility in treating penitents with guilt complexes, in reinforcing advice about relying on the power of God for depressed penitents who remain untouched by ordinary exhortation, in relieving "compulsive" tendencies, and in reducing the impact of "compulsive" ideas.

On the one hand Canon Law prohibits the practice of medicine and on the other hand nobody would deny the priest the decent use of waking suggestion. Hypnosis is in itself licit, the priest is a responsible agent in the care of souls and there are frequent situations in his work which would indicate hypnosis as the preferred method of treatment. The disadvantages to use of hypnosis by the clergy are twofold. In the first place when it comes to actually caring for the troubled psyche, mistakes are highly possible for the unskilled practitioner, e.g. the tendency to treat a symptom rather than the cause of the symptom, and the tendency to go too fast in delving into repressed material. The second disadvantage is that people generally do not think of the priest as a hypnotist.

Thus it would seem that use of hypnosis by a priest would have to be conditioned on the professional competence of the priest himself, on the approval of his ecclesiastical superiors, and on the

anesthesia. Granted the objective liceity of hypnosis and the legitimacy of purpose, from the doctor's point of view the following principle must be considered: ". . . as a private person, the doctor can take no measure or try no course of action without the consent of the patient. The doctor has no other rights or power over the patient than those which the latter gives him, explicitly or implicitly and tacitly."[1] Granted that the patient has with justification given such permission it would seem that the doctor could licitly use hypnosis.

From the patient's point of view, the permission must be justified. "In this discussion the decisive point is the moral licitness of the right a patient has to dispose of himself. . . . The patient, then, has no right to involve his physical or psychic integrity, in medical experiments or research when they entail serious destruction, mutilation, wounds or perils."[2] The following are two examples of this:

> . . . a man cannot perform on himself or allow doctors to perform acts of physical or somatic nature which doubtless relieve heavy physical or psychic burdens or infirmities, but which bring about at the same time permanent abolition or considerable and durable diminuation of his freedom, that is, of his human personality in its typical and characteristic function.
>
> . . . In order to rid himself of repressions, inhibitions or psychic complexes, man is not free to arouse in himself for therapeutic purposes each and every appetite of a sexual order which is being excited or has been excited in his being, appetites whose impure waves flood his unconscious or subconscious mind. He cannot make them the object of his thoughts and fully conscious desires with all the shocks and repercussions such a process entails. . . .[3]

These two examples refer to needless lobotomy and psychoanalysis by a pansexual theorist. In practice hypnosis has none of the effects ascribed to lobotomy. A few questions should determine whether the doctor is a pansexual theorist. The medical and psychological professions have sufficiently respectable status so that a patient could prudently assume that the doctor was a responsible agent.

[1] *Pius XII,* Discourse to the first International Congress on the Histopathology of the Nervous System, Sept. 14, 1952.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.*

If doubts arose in the process of treatment a priest should be consulted.

Hypnotism and suggestion are treated in the standard college course in psychology. Frequently the professor conducts classroom experiments with and demonstrations of such phenomena. Merklebach speaks of scientific investigation as a legitimate use of hypnosis, granted the skill of the hypnotist and the prudent selection of a subject. He does not say the classroom demonstration on the college level is an instance of scientific investigation. However, the techniques and effects of hypnotism are natural phenomena just as much as association and perception. Demonstration is a more effective pedagogical device than simple lecture. Thus it would seem that the scientific interests of college students and the pedagogical requirements of the educational situation would justify such demonstrations. Ordinarily the college authorities would not tolerate abuses, and professors could be assumed to be responsible men.

An interesting question arises as to the morality of the clergy practicing hypnotism. Any priest acquainted with hypnotic phenomena will quickly recognize its utility in treating penitents with guilt complexes, in reinforcing advice about relying on the power of God for depressed penitents who remain untouched by ordinary exhortation, in relieving "compulsive" tendencies, and in reducing the impact of "compulsive" ideas.

On the one hand Canon Law prohibits the practice of medicine and on the other hand nobody would deny the priest the decent use of waking suggestion. Hypnosis is in itself licit, the priest is a responsible agent in the care of souls and there are frequent situations in his work which would indicate hypnosis as the preferred method of treatment. The disadvantages to use of hypnosis by the clergy are twofold. In the first place when it comes to actually caring for the troubled psyche, mistakes are highly possible for the unskilled practitioner, e.g. the tendency to treat a symptom rather than the cause of the symptom, and the tendency to go too fast in delving into repressed material. The second disadvantage is that people generally do not think of the priest as a hypnotist.

Thus it would seem that use of hypnosis by a priest would have to be conditioned on the professional competence of the priest himself, on the approval of his ecclesiastical superiors, and on the

exclusion of unfavorable publicity. Hypnosis should never be employed as the discharge of a priestly function, but as psychological therapy *by a professional psychologist who is also a priest.* Because such conditions are rarely verified at the present time, it would seem most prudent to refer the penitent to a competent doctor or psychologist. Perhaps the day is not too far off, however, when specialized training in psychology and psychiatry will be undertaken by a large number of priests. In the near future it is to be expected that therapeutic hypnosis will have lost in the public mind the last unwholesome remnants of prejudice attached to it.

JOHN FEARON, O.P.

Los Angeles, Calif.

SEMINARY STUDY OF AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM

An English theologian recently visiting America asked to speak to the expert on Protestant theologies at a Catholic seminary. He was promptly informed that no such expert existed precisely because Protestantism is not theological. If the Englishman had put the question differently by asking for the expert on Protestantism, he would probably have been introduced to the Professor of Church History. Protestantism is too often treated in our seminaries as a sixteenth-century phenomena which has somehow perpetuated itself for the past four hundred years.

There is a commonplace objection addressed by our apologists to the Protestants. We remind them that so many of their protests against abuses date back to the sixteenth century and that these have since been reformed. We ask them to consider objectively the Church itself, ever vigorous in its defense of revealed truth and magnificent in its works of mercy. Protestants, however, may very well charge us with an outdated appraisal of their denominations, when we expect them to talk and behave like characters of the reformation era. A great deal of history has happened since the sixteenth century. Although some reformation teachings have been retained, these have been modified in a variety of ways.

Protestants themselves are not altogether agreed as to the connotation of Protestantism. High Church Episcopalians resent the term "Protestant Episcopal Church." There are Baptists who do not want to be called "Protestants" and a great many Protestants completely disclaim any fellowship with the Unitarians or the Jehovah's Witnesses. J. W. Allen indicates some of the difficulties involved in adequately identifying a Protestant even in the sixteenth century.[1]

It is not uncommon for the newly ordained as he steps from seminary to parish to be amazed at the discovery of a Protestantism very much alive in its twentieth-century modes of being. The central location of so many Protestant churches in town and city

[1] Cf. J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Methuen and Co., 1951), pp. 1-14.

throughout the nation is not merely a relic of their former prominence in the social life of a community. The degree of their vitality will of course vary and must be measured sectionally. In the Southern towns it looms very high, while in the big Northern cities it is a representative, although not the dominant factor.

THE ANALOGY OF PROTESTANTISM

The seminary approach to Protestantism as a sixteenth-century revolt against the Church can induce a univocal evaluation of Protestantism as if it is a universal concept that admits of definition, an essential meaning in the proper sense. This is not the case. A univocal term is one valued such as the term "rational animal." Rational animal can be predicated of all men in all ages and in all circumstances of life because it gives the essence of man. Protestantism never enjoyed this restriction in meaning. It is an analogous term, a term that is somewhat the same and somewhat different in meaning. It is polyvalent. Even in the sixteenth century it possessed a divergence of meaning. Luther himself was a different sort of Protestant in the various stages of his protests against the Church.

The common denominator of meaning is that Protestantism is always in some way protesting against the Roman Catholic Church. In this sense it is a relative term that must be related by way of negation to the Church of the ages. The particular kind of protestation, however, varies from age to age and from person to person. This variability is of the very nature of Protestantism. For there is nothing fixed and constant that can give form and unity to the whole cavalcade of the sects through history except their anti-Roman character. In this context the term "Protestant" is privative.

The Lutherans who signed the protest at the Diet of Spires (Speyer) in 1529, when the term "protestores" *testes pro reformatione* originated, are not the same in beliefs and practices as the Lutherans of the Swedish State Church at the time of Kierkegaard. A Lutheran of the Prussian Union in modern Germany is not the same as a Lutheran of the Missouri Synod. Quite apart from all these there is the Lutheran neo-Orthodox, Reinhold Niebuhr, a Lutheran without belief in the divinity of Christ.

Terms such as Lutheran, Episcopalian, Baptist, Methodist are not clear and distinct in meaning, if one is in search of essential

meanings. They are analogous terms like the term Protestantism itself. They do not signify people who believe as Luther believed, or Calvin or Wesley. Rather they are labels for people who call themselves followers of some eminent Protestant such as Luther, whom they interpret in the light of their own private consciences. The subjectivism of Protestantism engenders its relativism and pluralism.

There is a fluidity inherent in Protestantism by which it assumes the changing characteristics of the society in which it lives. This does not mean that there are no conservative forces in the denominations. On the contrary, there are trends especially in the older sects which strive to retain the standing order. In America these conservatives are called Fundamentalists. A Protestant conservative, however, is intelligible in the light of a given time in history relative to what he is conserving. An Anglican defending the Establishment against the Puritans would be a conservative in seventeenth-century England. A Puritan in America would be a conservative defending his Standing Order of Establishment in the Bay Colony against Roger Williams, the pioneer American Baptist.

The analogous character of the protests is what makes Protestantism difficult to understand in history. Although these protests in their most common context are anti-Roman, they are multiplied in a variety of ways as protests within Protestantism. Methodism, for example, is not intelligible in the light of the Reformation. It belongs to eighteenth-century England. Its founder, John Wesley, sought a religious revival for his countrymen. He protested in the main against the devitalized Christianity of the Anglican State Church. The Disciples of Christ, on the other hand, are a strictly made in the U. S. A. brand of protestation in what is called the Restoration Movement in the nineteenth century. Abner Jones, protesting against the Calvinism of his time, in a revolt against creeds organized a General Convention of Christian Churches. He rejected the Trinity and the divinity of Christ.

Paul Tillich of Harvard Divinity School in a telecast last New Year's Day described Protestantism as somewhat similar to Picasso's "Guernica," the portrayal of a Spanish town torn asunder in the Spanish "Civil War." Tillich observed: ". . . there you see the world in pieces, and that's the one side which Protestantism always . . . must emphasize." The Protestant confessions are

divided into sectarian piecemeal views more or less in a state of change. The sixteenth century reformation is but an initial stage in an evolution of protests that appear and disappear in the drama of man in search of the peace that the world cannot give.

NEO-LIBERALS AND NEO-ORTHODOX

The seminary professor cannot hope to acquaint the seminarian with all the details of the complex phenomena of Protestantism. At best he can present certain basic notions which will aid the future priest in understanding the analogy of Protestantism. Such a presentation should include some understanding of the Neo-Liberals and the Neo-Orthodox in America today. Although these men are intellectually very distant from the Reformers, they have a legitimate claim to the title of "Protestant" in a twentieth-century style of thought.

The Neo-Liberal Protestant denies the supernatural as did his Liberal forebearers. He is called a Neo-Liberal because he does not profess the philosophy of Kant or of Hegel, which characterized the old Liberals such as Adolf Harnack. In their stead he professes belief in some sort of empirical philosophy. In America the Neo-Liberals are more often proponents of Alfred North Whitehead or of John Dewey. Men like Edgar Brightman of Boston University, Walter Marshall Horton, Albert Knudson, Henry Wieman espouse these views in their thoroughly secularized "theologies."

The empiricist argues there is only one reality: what appears, whatever is given in perception, is real. There is nothing existing except what is present in the experience of subjects. The empiricist speaks of a finite God, the God of finite experience. Although the Neo-Liberals profess to be in revolt against the immanentism of the Liberals of the last century, there is much of subjectivism in their empirical philosophy. The calamitous experiences of World War I and II have also moved them far from the roseate optimism of the Victorian Liberals.

The gloomy Dean Inge is not the only representative of this twentieth century pessimism in Protestant thought. It is also evidenced in what is called Neo-Orthodoxy. The proponents of this trend are called Crisis Theologians. They adhere to some form of existentialist philosophy. Their primary concern is with

human existence in a dramatic light. This is not their only concern but it looms high in their writings. The tensions of modern man in his private life and in society is a favorite topic of Reinhold Niebuhr, recently appointed Vice-President of Union Theological Seminary in New York City. In Europe the names of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner are outstanding in this trend.

The name Neo-Orthodoxy is perhaps misleading. As Charles C. Morrison has noted, Neo-Orthodoxy retains an essential kinship with liberalism. The locus of revelation for the Neo-Orthodox is not the Scriptures but "in the living historical experience."[2]

Although the Neo-Liberal and the Neo-Orthodox are not appealing to the average Protestant, they do exert a considerable influence in the intellectual life of present-day American Protestantism. Men of the caliber of Billy Graham, Oral Roberts, and Norman Vincent Peale are more apt to draw large crowds to their services, whereas men like Reinhold Niebuhr and Paul Tillich are eminent in the domain of the universities and with the more sophisticated congregations. In fact, it is safe to say that the larger mass of American Protestants do not understand the meaning of these new "theologies." Religion is for them a golden rule way of life in which deeds are more important than creeds. They are not directly conscious of what so many of their intellectuals have done and are doing to "the old time religion."

One has only to compare the curriculum of the traditional Protestant seminary with a progressive seminary influenced by the new "theologies" to note the radical differences. The traditional Protestant seminary was organized around four fields of study: Exegetical Theology (Bible), Historical Theology (Church History), Systematic Theology (doctrinal), and Pastoral Theology. The progressive Harvard Divinity School is a good example of the new look in seminary training in a nondenominational Divinity School. Courses in Comparative Religion, Psychology and Sociology of Religion, Religion and Arts and so forth are now part of the program. There is generally more stress on method than on content. In the study of Systematic Theology, for example, the aim is "... to train ministers who are well equipped to present their faith, *whatever it might be* to the people of our time. . . ."[3]

[2] Cf. *The Christian Century,* LXVII, Nos. 23-25.

[3] *Harvard Divinity School, A Faculty Guide for Prospective Students,* p. 24.

Harvard Divinity was originally established as a reply of the Liberals or Unitarians to the Calvinists who founded Andover Theological Seminary. Its Constitution provided that "... no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination of Christians be required either of the Students or Instructors."[4]

Liberalizing trends have contributed a great deal toward the spread of Protestant ecumenism. The new theologies are themselves transconfessional and open to an inter-denominational dialogue by the ministers. They endorse the interchanging of pulpits and common communion services for all. Conservatives such as the Anglo-Catholics and Missouri Synod Lutherans oppose these practices, but they are gaining ground in the present day search of so many Protestants for Christian Unity. Unfortunately it is a unity proposed largely on the terms of the new theologies. Certain ritualistic externals which may accompany these trends such as were evidenced in the episcopal robes of Nathan Soderblom of Sweden and William Temple of Canterbury should not distract one from their basic liberalism.

The new "theologies" have contributed toward the abolition of the dour standards of the blue laws of the hyper-Calvinism that dominated American Protestant morals for so long a period. The old liberalism also contributed to this trend after World War I when so many changes were effected in manners and morals in America. The old time prohibitions against Demon Rum, Mistress Nicotine, the diabolism of card playing have passed away in many areas of the nation. But the liberation from the old standards did not stop here. It proceeded to spread a scepticism about the basic principles of the natural law so that in our times there are many ministers who advocate birth control, divorce, sterilization as solutions for some of our current tensions in society.

FALLACIES TO BE AVOIDED

When these facts of present day Protestantism in America are presented to the seminarian, a special care must be taken that he does not generalize them beyond their proper limits. The analogy of Protestantism must be kept in mind. It would be fallacious to judge them by the sixteenth century confessions of protestations against Rome. Sometimes this is not attended to and the seminarian

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

assumes that contemporary American Protestants are for the most part victims of Neo-Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy. Such is not the case. That the new "theologies" exert a wide influence is to be conceded, especially Neo-Liberalism, but the practical meaning of their influence must be empirically established.

The judgment: "Protestants are Neo-Liberals" is indefinite. Which Protestants are you talking about? If this can be established by the facts of a person's thoughts as spoken or written, then it can be maintained. Sometimes, however, a Protestant's identity must be assumed as a matter of opinion. There are semantic difficulties to be overcome in understanding precisely what is being asserted. A Protestant may disclaim that he denys the divinity of Our Lord precisely because for him all is divine. The dating of an opinion is a very important matter because of the fluidity of opinions in the analogy of Protestantism.

An outstanding example of the use of overgeneralization was given by some Catholic journalists reporting on a survey made by the author regarding Protestant beliefs in the divine maternity.[5] This survey showed that some Protestant ministers deny that Mary is the Mother of God: 63 ministers responded in the negative out of 100 surveyed. Although the author warned against drawing conclusions beyond the limits of the study, some journalists reported: "Protestant Ministers Deny the Divine Maternity."

There are bigoted persons who are all too eager to use the mistaken reports of some Catholics about Protestants as examples of Catholic ignorance of Protestantism. Seminarians should especially be trained to establish their statements about Protestants objectively and not by hearsay or garbled reports. They must be made to see that universal judgments must be judiciously made about Protestants, that Protestantism is analogous and that the question: "Which Protestants am I talking about?" is elementary.

In American society priests and ministers are sometimes called upon to co-operate in some endeavor for the moral good of the community. We are not speaking here of inter-faith meetings but rather of the joint action of religious leaders in some civic problem that involves the morality of the citizens. In the armed services such co-operation is commonplace and has been effected without religious compromises in a spirit of cordiality. In town and city

[5] Cf. *Marian Studies,* VI, 137-63.

efforts are being made at the present time by priests and ministers in some areas of the nation to have God and the moral law enter into the curriculum of the public schools. Seminary training of the future priest should acquaint him with the facts of present day Protestantism in America so that he will have a background briefing that will equip him with some basic understanding of American Protestants. Consequently he will not be given to undue generalizations about Protestant disbelief in the moral law and he will be enabled to appraise the opinions of ministers through an understanding of their particular approach to the problems.

Many a priest in convert work has learned from experience the value of first listening to the position of a Protestant before explaining the teachings of the Church. Very often he has found that the art of the good listener is a valuable characteristic of the good apologist. There are times when the only claim that a person has to the title of Protestant is the desire for some religious identity. In the armed services, for example, a person who is not Catholic or Jewish is often classified as a Protestant so long as he does not object to this identity. Polemics against sixteenth century reformation opinions are often unnecessary. In each case of instruction of a non-Catholic, diagnosis must precede prognosis.

SEMINAR IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM

At some time in the seminarian's training a concentration on contemporary American Protestantism should be presented. The ideal form of teaching this subject would seem to be the seminar. It would be quite impossible to expect the dogma courses to offer such a concentration. The occasional references to Protestant teachings as against the thesis under consideration are not adequate. The great amount of material to be covered in the dogma courses in a prescribed period of time also would prohibit a detailed survey of the errors current in American Protestantism. The ideal solution seems to be special seminar.

The material of the courses would be historical and doctrinal. The historical section should not attempt to cover the hundreds of sects on the American scene. The division of the material is of course arbitrary. One might divide the sects into the larger and smaller Protestant bodies. Concentration could be made on the larger bodies which are the big five in American Protestantism:

the Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, and the Protestant Episcopal Church. An historical synopsis of these denominations in America could be obtained from the *Encyclopedia Americana.*

The smaller sects in America are surviving forms of pietist trends of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the Mennonites and Schwenkfelders. A survey of some of these sects might be presented from the synopses of F. E. Mayer in *The Religious Bodies in America.*[6] Some of the smaller sects are sprung from the American soil. They may be found in small towns in the mountains or in the dreary slums of the cities. They promise some apocalyptic days ahead. The Jehovah's Witnesses are an example of the small sect of American origin.

The doctrinal content of the survey could be based on a presentation of modernism or liberalism and neo-liberalism, fundamentalism, neo-orthodoxy and ecumenical theology. Articles by Mayer in his *Religious Bodies in America* are brief surveys of these trends. Father Weigel's *A Survey of Protestant Theology in Our Day* is a concise and comprehensive summary of present day Protestant trends of thought presented in a readable style.[7] *Fifty Years of Protestant Theology* by Carl Henry of the Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California, is a clearly written, informative work.[8] It is especially valuable because of the ability of the author to reduce these abstruse trends to their fundamental meanings. Father Hanahoe's doctoral dissertation: *Catholic Ecumenism* is an important source book for papal documents on Christian Unity and the contemporary Protestant attempts toward the reunion of Christians.[9]

In the evaluation of the liberalizing trends of the more contemporary Protestant thinkers, it is well to judge these in the light of censures against modernism. The Neo-Orthodox and

[6] F. E. Mayer, *The Religious Bodies in America* (St. Louis: Concordia Press, 1954).

[7] G. Weigel, S.J., *A Survey of Protestant Theology in Our Day* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1954). 58 pages with bibliography.

[8] C. F. Henry, *Fifty Years of Protestant Theology* (Boston: Wilde Co., 1950). 113 pages.

[9] Edward F. Hanahoe, S.A., *Catholic Ecumenism* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953). 182 pages equipped with an excellent bibliography.

Neo-Liberal schools embody the denial of the supernatural and the naturalizing of Christianity which characterized the modernist movement. There is of course a change in the vocabulary and in minor details of doctrine but essentially the errors are the same.

The extent of such a seminar in terms of time and the more detailed content of the course is a matter of prudence to be judged in accordance with the circumstances of a seminary. The fact is that such a study is needed for the more complete education of the clerical mind in America today—in our society which is affected in so many ways by the Protestant heritage. There are some 50 million Protestants in the United States. They constitute about one-fourth of world Protestantism, which is estimated at some 200 million souls.[10] In 1954 it was estimated that Protestants numbered 35.3 of the total population of this country.[11]

The Catholic priest should know the current trends in the analogy of Protestantism as a shepherd of his flock and as one called to gather the other sheep into the one fold. Pope Pius XII has indicated the duty of Catholic theologians and philosophers: "They have a grave responsibility for defending truth, both divine and human, and for instilling it into the minds of men; they must needs acquaint themselves with all these speculations, to a more or less extent erroneous; they must needs take them into account. Nay it is their duty to have a thorough understanding of them."[12]

KENNETH DOUGHERTY, S.A.

Atonement Seminary
Washington, D. C.

[10] Cf. *Karte der Religionem und Evangelischen Missionem der Erde* (Stuttgart, 1955).

[11] Cf. *Yearbook of the American Churches* (1955), edited by B. Landis, pp. vi, 269.

[12] Pius XII, *Humani generis*, Aug. 12, 1950 (*A.A.S.*, XXXII, 563, 4).

INTELLECTUAL STANDARDS AMONG AMERICAN CATHOLICS

Very seldom during the lifetime of this generation have we encountered a rather brief article which has aroused intense interest from the very moment of its publication, and which has continued to be the center of lively and valuable discussion over a long period.

Yet such prompt and continuing interest has been given in the case of a contribution by Msgr. John Tracy Ellis of the Catholic University of America to the review *Thought*. This article, now accompanied by a preface from His Excellency, the Most Rev. John J. Wright, Bishop of Worcester, has recently appeared in book form, under the title *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life*.[1]

Bishop Wright has characterized this paper by Monsignor Ellis as "the most provocative, quite possibly the best, of many which have appeared in recent months as the 'great debate' on Catholic American intellectualism."[2] There can be no question whatsoever about the fact that it has been by far the most influential contribution to this debate. Apparently most of those who have contributed to his discussion in published writings have been in enthusiastic agreement with Monsignor Ellis. And, among the great majority who have not published or publicized their views on the subject treated in his paper, a tremendous number have reacted favorably to his contentions.

Monsignor Ellis himself has described his work as "a discussion of the historic background and present status of the Catholic intellectual," offered in a "candid and critical spirit."[3] His central thesis is presented in three forms.

First, he cites a statement from an English professor to the effect that "in no Western society is the intellectual prestige of Catholicism lower than in the country where, in such respects as wealth, numbers, and strength of organization, it is so powerful."

[1] The book, of 63 pages, is published by The Heritage Foundation, Inc., Chicago.

[2] *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life*, p. 5.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

Monsignor Ellis adds: "No well-informed American Catholic will attempt to challenge that statement."[4]

Several pages later he repeats the basic message of his article. "Up to this point," he tells us, "I have assumed general agreement as to the impoverishment of Catholic scholarship in this country, as well as to the low state of Catholic leadership in most walks of national life."[5]

The third, and by far the most important statement of his basic contention forms the conclusion to *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life.*

> In conclusion, then, one may say that it has been a combination of all the major points made in this paper, along with others which I may have failed to consider, that has produced in American Catholics generally, as well as in the intellectuals, a pervading spirit of separatism from their fellow citizens of other religious faiths. They have suffered from the timidity that characterizes minority groups, from the effects of a ghetto they have themselves fostered, and, too, from a sense of inferiority induced by their consciousness of the inadequacy of Catholic scholarship. But who, one may rightly ask, has been responsible in the main for its inadequacy? Certainly not the Church's enemies. . . . The major defect, therefore, lies elsewhere than with the unfriendly attitude of some of those outside the Church. The chief blame, I firmly believe, lies with Catholics themselves. It lies in their frequently self-imposed ghetto mentality which prevents them from mingling as they should with their non-Catholic colleagues, and in their lack of industry and the habits of work, to which Hutchins alluded in 1937. It lies in their failure to have measured up to their responsibilities to the incomparable tradition of which they are the direct heirs, a failure which Peter Viereck noted, and which suggested to him the caustic question, "Is the honorable adjective 'Roman Catholic' truly merited by America's middleclass-Jansenist Catholicism, puritanized, Calvinized and dehydrated . . .?[6]

The "major points" to which Monsignor Ellis alludes in the first sentence of the passage just cited are the topics or factors in American Catholic life and history which, in his opinion, serve to explain the "discrepancy" mentioned in the first statement of his central thesis, the disharmony between the good condition of the Catholic

[4] *Ibid.*, pp .15 f.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 47.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 56 f.

Church in the United States of America in terms of numbers and organization, and its lack of intellectual prestige. Among these "major points" he mentions the following:

(1) The existence in this country of a deep-rooted anti-Catholic bias.[7]

(2) "The character and background of a major portion of the people who, until a relatively recent date, made up the Church in the United States."[8]

(3) The fact that Catholics adopted an American attitude of distrust and suspicion of scholars and academicians.[9]

(4) "The absence of an intellectual tradition among American Catholics."[10]

(5) The fact that Catholics adopted the American attitude of "attachment to material goods and the desire to make a fortune."[11]

(6) "The failure of Catholics in posts of leadership, both clerical and lay, to understand fully or to appreciate in a practical way, the value of the vocation of the intellectual."[12] Monsignor Ellis lists as factors which have contributed to the failure of the clerical leaders along this line "personal backgrounds, the harassing day-to-day duties of administration, and the national temper of practicality"[13] as well as the fact that these churchmen "have not been able to draw upon a well-established intellectual tradition inherited from the countries of their origin."[14] And he adds that "the failure of American churchmen to find guidance and inspiration from a strong intellectual tradition in the lands of their ancestors was in no way compensated by the training they received in preparation for their priesthood, whether that be in diocesan seminaries or in the scholasticates of the religious orders."[15]

(7) Catholic colleges in the United States have neglected what should have been their own tradition and have gone off to imitate the less desirable features of non-Catholic academic life. Monsignor

[7] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 16-18.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[9] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 19 ff.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

Ellis complains that the scholastic revival in philosophy found its most enthusiastic and hard-working friends on the campuses of non-Catholic educational institutions, rather than in Catholic colleges and universities.[16]

(8) Another "major defect in Catholic higher education" is to be found in "the development within the past two decades of numerous and competing graduate schools, none of which is adequately endowed, and few of which have the trained personnel, the equipment in libraries and laboratories, and the professional wage scales to warrant their ambitious undertakings."[17]

(9) The final point to which Monsignor Ellis alludes is "the absence of a love of scholarship for its own sake among American Catholics, and that even among too large a number of Catholics who are engaged in higher education."[18]

These are the major points made and developed in the paper. As Monsignor Ellis sees it, a combination of these factors has resulted in a spirit of separatism on the part of American Catholics as a group, and of the intellectuals among them. The effects of this separatism, or "ghetto mentality," together with a timidity and a sense of inferiority induced by their consciousness of the inadequacy of Catholic scholarship, have conspired to produce results detrimental to the Catholics of the United States. The inadequacy of Catholic scholarship in this country is itself the fault of the Catholics, who have brought it about through their self-imposed ghetto mentality, their lack of industry, and their failure to avail themselves of their own traditional possessions in the field of learning.

In support of his main thesis Monsignor Ellis points to "a few of the many studies that have been made in the last quarter century on the subject of the relationship between religious affiliation and national leadership, especially in intellectual affairs." Among these are two articles, published in 1927, showing that American Catholics, in proportion to their numerical strength in this country, had a strikingly small representation in the then current issue of *Who's Who*.[19] Another article, published in 1931, and a book which appeared only four years ago, showed the scarcity

[16] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 42.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 44.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[19] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 47 f.

of Catholics in general, and of Catholic college graduates, among the leading scientists in the United States.[20] The same conclusion is suggested by the makeup of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, founded by the present Holy Father in 1936.[21] Also cited were a study, published in 1941, showing that Catholic colleges placed relatively few students in graduate schools other than professional institutions for training in law and in medicine,[22] and a 1953 document which had this to say about our colleges and universities: "We had expected that Catholic institutions would be marked by relatively large contributions to the field of humanities. In this speculation, however, we were again mistaken. Catholic institutions, though exceptionally unproductive in all areas of scholarship, achieve their best record in the sciences."[23] Other sources, some of them of lesser importance, are also mentioned in support of Monsignor Ellis's thesis.

Granting the objectivity of all these statistical studies, however, it is still difficult to see just how they support the central contentions of *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life.* It is a fact, a widely known and deplorable fact, that American Catholics do not furnish a great number of entries in *Who's Who* or in *American Men of Science.* It is likewise a fact, and a deplorable fact, that a good many men graduate from college with liberal arts degrees and with no firm intention of continuing and expanding their interests in the central subjects studied in a liberal arts course. Yet, unsatisfactory as the situation may be, it certainly does not prove or come near proving that Catholic scholarship in this country is impoverished, or that the intellectual prestige of Catholicism is particularly low in the United States of America.

Now Catholic scholarship would be genuinely impoverished in any country in which a rather considerable and otherwise able Catholic population failed to attain the objectives of Catholic education. This would be the case where Catholics who should be good scholars were failures in their own works and in their own subjects. No such indications are given in any of the studies cited in *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life.*

[20] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 48 ff.

[21] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 50.

[22] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 52 ff .

[23] *Ibid.,* p. 55. The citation is from Knapp and Greenbaum, *The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins* (Chicago, 1953), p. 99.

It seems quite obvious that, in any discussion of Catholic scholarship in terms of impoverishment or of adequacy, there must be an appeal to some sort of norm. Our scholarship, in this or any other country, can be rightly designated as impoverished only if it fails to meet the standards for intellectual activity. Thus, if it could be shown that the writings or the teachings of Catholics, in the realm of any section of the intellectual life, were considerably below the average, or in any way less than what is rightly to be expected from Catholic students, it would be true that our scholarship is impoverished.

The central and the most important element of the Catholic scholarship in any country is, of course, theological. Now the chief norm to which Monsignor Ellis appeals as an indication of excellence for writings, even on the theological level, is acceptance and citation of these writings by some non-Catholic intellectual. "When the inescapable and exacting labor of true scholarship is intelligently directed and competently expressed," he tells us, "it will win its way on its own merits into channels of influence beyond the Catholic pale."[24] Monsignor Ellis supports his contention by assuring us that the thought and research of two Catholic scholars on vital aspects of the current crisis have been brought to the attention of thousands of Americans "through the use that has been made of them by Walter Lippmann in his latest book."[25]

It seems clear that Monsignor Ellis is referring to sympathetic use of Catholic writings by non-Catholic intellectuals. We must not lose sight of the fact that not all such use is sympathetic. To mention only one case in point: a few months ago the magazine *Time* cited one of the responses written by Father Connell, a member of the editorial board of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* for the *Answers to Questions* section of our periodical.[26] Father Connell's teaching was completely accurate and well expressed. It was a correct statement of the Church's own law and doctrine. And it was

[24] *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life,* pp. 57 f.

[25] *Ibid.,* p. 58.

[26] Cf. *Time,* LXVIII, 2 (July 9, 1956), 38. The *Time* article quoted from and commented on Father Connell's response to a question on "Co-Operation Toward Non-Catholic Worship," which appeared in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXXXIV, 6 (June, 1956), 414 f. Father Connell has written an enlightening review of the affair in *AER,* CXXXV, 4 (Oct., 1956), 267-71, under the heading "Broadmindedness or Indifferentism?".

violently attacked in letters printed in a subsequent issue of *Time*,[27] and in various communications sent to him personally, and to me as editor of the *Review*. Furthermore, it seemed quite obvious that the editors of *Time* disapproved of it.

If sympathetic acceptance of Catholic teaching by writers and readers of non-Catholic literary works were to serve as a norm for excellence in Catholic intellectual work, then Father Connell's response would have been an example of decidedly impoverished Catholic scholarship. Fortunately however, such sympathetic acceptance in no way constitutes a standard of theological adequacy. Father Connell's teaching was and remains an example of vigorous and accurate theological scholarship and writing. It was wholly in accord with the immediate and practical norm of theological excellence: the doctrine of the Catholic Church's living *magisterium*.

On the other hand, there are times when the sympathetic citation of a Catholic writer in the field of sacred theology by some non-Catholic intellectual is definitely not an indication that the Catholic's teachings are accurate and acceptable. Thus, for example, in the October, 1956, issue of the magazine *Harper's*, there was an editorial directed against the National Organization for Decent Literature. The tone and the animus of this editorial can be appreciated by an examination of some statements in the opening paragraphs.

> A little band of Catholics is now conducting a shocking attack on the rights of their fellow citizens. They are engaged in an un-American activity which is as flagrant as anything the Communist party ever attempted—and which is, in fact, very similar to Communist tactics. They are harming their country, their Church, and the cause of freedom. . . .
>
> They do not, of course, speak for all Catholics. On the contrary, they are defying the warnings of some of their Church's most respected teachers and theologians. . . .
>
> This group calls itself the National Organization for Decent Literature. Its headquarters are in Chicago; its director is the Very Reverend Monsignor Thomas Fitzgerald. Its main purpose is to make it impossible for anybody to buy books and other publications which it does not like. . . .
>
> Its chief method is to put pressure on newsdealers, drug stores, and

---

[27] Cf. *Time*, LXVIII, 5 (July 30, 1956), 4.

booksellers, to force them to remove from their stocks every item on the NODL blacklist.[28]

Now, as the editorial writer of *Harper's* should have known very well, the National Organization for Decent Literature is not a little band of Catholics acting apart from ecclesiastical authority. The Organization is actually under the direction of an Episcopal Committee, appointed by the Bishops of the United States during their annual meeting in Washington each November. The present chairman of that Committee is His Excellency the Most Reverend John F. Dearden, Bishop of Pittsburgh.[29] Monsignor Fitzgerald is the executive secretary of the Organization, working under the direction of Bishop Dearden and his Committee of Bishops.

The main purpose of the Organization is definitely not to make it impossible for anyone to buy books or publications which it does not like, but it simply aims to oppose the distribution of morally filthy books and magazines in otherwise legitimate places of business. *The Harper's* editorialist himself states that "A good many tawdry and disreputable magazines, paper-bound reprints, and comic books have been offered for sale on a lot of newsstands."[30] He further admits that "A few publishers unquestionably have tried to base their sales appeals on sex and violence; the pictures and text on the covers of their publications often hint that the contents are far more salacious than they are in fact."[31] And he urges the newsdealers and booksellers who may be approached by the National Organization for Decent Literature to "set their own house in order," and to "refuse to sell any publication which—in their own untrammeled judgment—falls below their own standards as responsible businessmen."[32]

In other words, the *Harper's* writer assures us that in drug stores and newsstands in this country today there are frequently more or

[28] *Harper's,* CCXIII, 1277 (Oct., 1956), 14. The editorial, written by John Fischer, the editor in chief of this magazine, is entitled "The Harm Good People Do."

[29] The Committee on the National Organization for Decent Literature is listed on p. 517 of the *1956 National Catholic Almanac* among the Bishops' Special Committees, and under the general heading of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The Committee was set up in 1938.

[30] Fischer, *op. cit.,* 16.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] *Ibid.,* 18 f.

less salacious publications offered for sale. He advises the owners and operators of the places in which these objectionable periodicals are exposed to make available to their customers only those publications which happen to conform to their own standards of morality. He is furiously opposed to any suggestions or requests coming from Catholics and tending to keep objectively immoral printed matter off bookshelves to which children of the neighborhood have easy and constant access. He approves of censorship by the sellers (and presumably by publishers), but vehemently sets himself against any suggestions offered in this direction by Catholic citizens.

The *Harper's* editorial is distinctly not opposed to all control of the reading matter exposed for sale in such places as drug stores and newsstands. It insists that some control be exercised. The author, however, is adamant in his contention that a Catholic organization should make no requests along this line. And, if the members of that Catholic organization make requests that are not granted, they must not, on that account, cease to patronize the store where the offending material is offered for sale. If they pursue such a course, then they are, according to the *Harper's* editor, using their chosen weapons of "boycott and literary lynching."[33]

In itself the *Harper's* diatribe is not important. It is only another one of those attempts to attach a spurious sanctity to the work and the place of business of the seller of printed matter. But what gives it a certain importance in this discussion of *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life* is the fact that the editor of *Harper's* appeals to, and to a certain extent builds his article around, a somewhat long quotation from a Catholic writer in the field of sacred theology.

Here, then, is a case in which a Catholic writer's work has won its way "on its own merits into channels of influence beyond the Catholic pale." Quite obviously the editor of *Harper's* approved of the teaching he cited, and tried by every means within his power to bring this teaching to the attention of thousands of Americans. Yet, as it turns out, the teaching cited was acceptable to the writer of the editorial only because and insofar as it failed to attain the objective of scientific theological accuracy. The citation used in this editorial met the requirement set up by Monsignor Ellis for

[33] Cf. *ibid.*, 14.

excellence in Catholic intellectual endeavor. But, for all that, it definitely was a very poor example of Catholic scholarship. Sympathetic acceptance or even citation of Catholic writings in the field of sacred theology by non-Catholic intellectuals in no way guarantees the scholastic or scientific values of these writings. And, on the other hand, there is neither certainty nor any degree of probability that genuinely good writings by Catholics in the field of theology will be cited or even received sympathetically by any considerable number of non-Catholic intellectuals.

If fault can be found with the chief standard of excellence for Catholic theological writings set forth in *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life,* legitimate questions can also be raised about Monsignor Ellis's basic conclusions and about some of the "major points" in which these conclusions are said to be explained.

Monsignor Ellis contends that, as a result of these "major points," and perhaps of some other factors, there has resulted in American Catholics generally, and even in the intellectuals among them, "a pervading spirit of separatism from their fellow citizens of other religious faiths."[34] He speaks of our Catholics as adversely affected by "the effects of a ghetto they have themselves fostered," and he likewise refers to the Catholics' "self-imposed ghetto mentality."[35]

Monsignor Ellis is by no means the first Catholic writer to use the term "ghetto" with reference to Catholic life in the United States. Such expressions as "Catholic ghetto" and "Catholic ghetto mentality" have been widely employed by one class of Catholic writers for the past few years. Properly speaking, a ghetto was a section of a city within which that city's Jewish population was forced to live, or a section which is, *de facto,* inhabited by Jews, at least according to ordinary dictionary usage. Quite obviously the term could not possibly be employed in any proper sense with reference to the Catholic population of the United States or any other country. And, if it is used in a figurative or metaphorical way, it is at best offensive and misleading. As far as I know, Catholics as such have never been restricted by law to any section of one of our American towns or cities. And, since any voluntary separation of Catholics from other Americans is unfavorably de-

[34] Cf. *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life,* p. 56.
[35] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 56 f.

scribed in terms of a ghetto, it would seem that this use of the term involves a gratuitously offensive reference to Jews of other lands who *de facto* chose to reside apart from others. The description of a Catholic group in terms of a section inhabited by people who reject Christ is certainly offensive to Catholics.

It is very difficult indeed to find any objective justification for the charge of separatism made against the Catholic people or the Catholic intellectuals of the United States. In every American city or town in which I have ever been, I have found Catholic churches, and presumably Catholic parishioners, in every section of the place. Everywhere I have been I have found Catholics living beside non-Catholic neighbors, working with them, and associating with them in recreation, in politics, in the armed services, and in every other field apart from that of religion itself. If this be separatism, then it is a mild separatism indeed.

There does indeed exist a separatist mentality which is unfortunate and which certainly is not common among the Catholics it has been my good fortune to know. This mentality is the effect of a kind of inferiority feeling, and it seeks above all other things acceptance and recognition by groups which the possessor of this mentality holds in high esteem, and from which he believes he is or has been rightly excluded by reason of his Catholicism. The Catholic author, particularly in the field of sacred theology, who writes primarily with a view of being accepted and praised by non-Catholic intellectuals, and of perhaps being admitted into their company, is a victim of such a separatist mentality. But we may be grateful that this mentality is in no way characteristic of the general run of Catholic life in the United States of America.

Monsignor Ellis speaks of his "major points" as factors tending towards the production of a spirit of separatism among Catholics of this country. Two of these points are assertions that Catholics in the United States adopted an American attitude of distrust and suspicion towards scholars and intellectuals,[36] and that they also adopted the American attitude of "attachment to material goods and the desire to make a fortune."[37] Certainly these two "major points" do not indicate the existence of anything like a spirit of separatism among our Catholics. Likewise the charge made against

[36] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 19 ff.
[37] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 27.

the Catholic colleges in this country, to the effect that they imitated the less desirable features of non-Catholic institutions of learning,[38] does not favor any allegation of separatism.

From my own experience and observation, and from the testimony of competent men I have consulted, I can find no indication that American Catholic families were in any way especially deficient in intellectual activities or intellectual tastes. And I have never encountered any evidence that American Catholics, or, for that matter, any other Americans, were particularly suspicious of or opposed to scholars and teachers. Certainly the fact that such terms as "brain trusters" have been used in a pejorative sense in American politics cannot be adduced as an indication of any attitude of this kind. In the turmoil of our political life, it seems quite obvious that whatever opposition "eggheads" or "brain trusters" encountered came from the fact that their opponents did not like the policies these gentlemen proposed. There is nothing whatsoever to indicate that they were opposed precisely because they cultivated intellectual tastes or intellectual pursuits.

Again, it is difficult to see any objective grounds for the complaint that Catholic clerical leaders failed "to understand fully or to appreciate in a practical way, the value of the vocation of the intellectual."[39] *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life* deals with this charge, not as a thesis to be demonstrated, but as an obvious fact to be explained. Monsignor Ellis attempts to explain it by mentioning, as contributing factors to the failure of these clerical leaders, "personal backgrounds, the harrassing day-to-day duties of administration, and the national temper of practicality,"[40] as well as a lack of intellectual tradition inherited from the countries of origin of these churchmen.[41] He likewise considers their seminary training as in some way unfit for future leaders of the Church.[42] He cites sympathetically some statements written by Father Smith in 1896 deploring what he considered the poor condition of teaching in the seminary at that time. Father Smith wrote:

The habits of the intellectual life in the seminary have dwarfed him [the American priest]. The curriculum rarely recognizes anything but

[38] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 43.
[39] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 33-40.
[40] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 35 ff.
[41] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 35 ff.
[42] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 38 ff.

theology and philosophy, and these often isolated from present conditions and without practical knowledge . . . [and] . . . History is taught in random, unscientific fashion, to judge the method by the results. . . . It is not then a cause for wonder that the young priest should graduate so rude and unfinished. The wonder is that he should at all be able to hold his own in the sneering world, so skilled in knowledge of its times, so devoted to science and history. . . .[43]

According to Monsignor Ellis, this stricture against seminary training sixty years ago "prompts one to ask if it is not still substantially true."[44]

In point of fact, however, the record shows that never in all the history of civilization has there been a body of men who have done more for the cause of education and of the intellectual life than the Bishops and the religious superiors of the United States. The system of Catholic schools, colleges, and universities erected and developed by these men during the comparatively short life of our republic is nothing less than astounding. In building up and perfecting this system, these men have certainly not been guided by any desire of attaining mere acceptance or approval by non-Catholic sources. They have worked so that their people could be genuine scholars, aware of the truths of the natural and the supernatural orders. They have been aware of the fact that the supernatural order is completely real, and that ignorance of the truths of this order, or worse still, erroneous notions about them, constitute the gravest of intellectual evils.

The work they built up is the one thus described by Pope Pius XI:

Our Catholic institutions, whatever their grade in the educational and scientific world, have no need of apology. The esteem they enjoy, the praise they receive, the learned works which they promote and produce in such abundance, and, above all, the men, fully and splendidly equipped, whom they provide for the magistracy, for the professions, for the teaching career, in fact for every walk of life, more than sufficiently testify in their favor.[45]

---

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 39. The citation is from John Talbot Smith, *Our Seminaries. An Essay on Clerical Training* (New York, 1896), p. 251.

[44] *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life,* p. 39.

[45] Pope Pius XI, in the encyclical *Divini illius magistri,* issued Dec. 31, 1929. I have used the NCWC translation (Washington, 1936), p. 22.

What is distinctive, of course, about Catholic scholarship and the Catholic intellectual life, is the teaching of the Catholic faith. The man who has learned the content of that faith is in possession of the highest truth, the highest intellectual good. And the men who contradict the content of that teaching, however formidable their theses may appear, are, in the last analysis, in error. And men are not, or at least should not be, designated as intellectuals because they hold mistaken views.

American Catholics and the Intellectual Life is, and was certainly meant to be, a stimulating work. It seems quite obvious that it was intended as a spur to urge Catholics onward in lives of study, to convince them that they have no reason for smug complacency in their present educational situation. To this extent it has succeeded very well. But the reader must never lose sight of the fact that the good of the intellect is to be found only in the possession of the truth itself. Quite evidently it would be a good thing for more Catholics to take up higher courses of studies. Evidently, too, the content of many of the courses in our Catholic institutions of higher learning can and should be improved. Greater concern for accuracy and adequacy can and should characterize our teaching efforts.

But, in the last analysis, we must not lose sight of the fact that our intellectual standard must always be that of truth itself. Catholic truth, even in the least pretentious of our religious texts, remains the truth. Any contradiction of the Catholic revealed message, even in the most scholarly and erudite tomes, remains an error. And most certainly the standard by which we judge our productions in the field of theology must not be the pedestrian and inaccurate norm of favorable acceptance by non-Catholic writers.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

COMMUNION CALL PROCEDURE

Question: The books on Liturgy inform you that when you have completed your communion sick calls and have no Sacred Particles remaining, you are to purify the pyx with water and then carry this water to the church and deposit it in the sacrarium. This is a practical impossibility. The common practice is to have the last communicant receive the water that you have used to purify the pyx. You give him this water on a spoon. This custom, too, is not practical, for often the person cannot receive the water without some of it spilling on his or her chin. What is the correct procedure to follow in purifying the pyx at this time?

Answer: The books do describe this ceremony as our inquirer indicates. In fact, some rituals go a step further and direct that this water be thrown in the fire. What fire, we ask, in this day when we have oil burners and gas-fed furnaces supplying the heat for our houses? We gather that the priests are few and far between that follow this directive.

To carry the water back to the church's sacrarium is awkward and impractical. To give this water used to purify the fingers of the priest in a spoon to the communicant is not practical, besides being unappetizing. Why not follow the practice employed by many priests? Moisten a small corner of the purificator to clean the pyx and purify the fingers of the priest administering Holy Communion. When finished, turn in this moistened corner of the purificator and proceed with the rest of the ceremony. After using the purificator a few times, replace it with a clean one.

IMPERATA AT SUNDAY HIGH MASS

Question: We have in our diocese an *imperata pro re gravi.* In this *imperata* given a separate conclusion in sung Masses on

Sunday or is it joined with the oration of the day *sub unica conclusione?*

Answer: The *imperata* is given a separate conclusion and is not joined *sub unica conclusione* to the oration of Sunday's Mass.

NUPTIAL BLESSING OUTSIDE OF MASS

Question: In using the new ritual at afternoon weddings between two Catholics, do you still use the prayers from the old ritual for the nuptial blessing, even though it is quite similar to the prayers found in the new ritual?

Answer: If the *Collectio Rituum* or so-called new ritual is being used, all the prayers for the marriage ceremony are taken from it. We are not to use one book for part of the ceremony and the other for the balance of the ceremony. Recently, we were instructed that "it is not permitted for priests to use the English translation for that part of the Nuptial Blessing (as found in the *Collectio Rituum*) that is read during the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass." Hence, only the customary Latin form may be used whenever the Nuptial Blessing is given *intra Missam.* The instruction forbids the use of the English translation only during Mass, but says nothing about it when the nuptial blessing is given outside of Mass.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOLY COMMUNION

Question: In distributing Holy Communion these questions come to my mind. Does the celebrant always close the tabernacle door? Are the cover and veil of the ciborium kept on the corporal?

Answer: Most rubricists direct that the tabernacle door should be closed during the distribution of Holy Communion except if the tabernacle is empty. The veil and cover of the ciborium are to be removed separately and the veil is placed off the corporal while the lid or cover remains on the corporal.

PROPER COLOR

Question: With the new regulations, we are permitted more votive Masses. It also presents a problem. What color tabernacle

veil and antependium are we to use on these days? On a ferial day we are permitted to say the Mass of the previous Sunday, the Mass of a semi-double that has been reduced to a simple office, or a requiem Mass or a votive Mass. With such a variety of choice, what color tabernacle veil do we keep?

Answer: The rubrics of the Roman Missal direct that tabernacle veil and antependium should be the same color as that of the feast or of the office of the day. For example, this season of the year, Sundays after Pentecost, would require us to have a green tabernacle veil and antependium. If there should be a solemn votive Mass or a solemn Mass with deacon and subdeacon or a Funeral Mass, it is fitting to have the tabernacle veil and antependium correspond in color to the Mass being offered. However, this is not the case when private votive Masses are being offered.

MASS FACING CONGREGATION

Question: We are planning a new church and some thought has been given to the possibility of a double altar so that Mass can be said facing the people. However, we wonder about canon law on this point.

Answer: Father J. B. O'Connell (*Church Building and Furnishing*) says that "there is no written law forbidding the celebration of Mass facing the congregation, in fact provision is made for it in the rubrics—but in many places there is a legal custom to the contrary, and so permission of the Ordinary must first be obtained before it may be done, and before building an altar for this purpose. To celebrate Mass in this way, turned to the people, is more logical (especially in regard to the parts directly addressed to them), and as it makes it easier to see and hear the celebration, it renders active participation by the people more feasible. A further advantage is that it would keep the high altar clear of retables, gradines, etc., and 'ornaments'. There are, however, practical difficulties about the structure of an altar fitted for this celebration because of the obstruction to the view of the people caused by the essential altar furnishings (cross and candlesticks) and by the tabernacle, which is normally on the high altar. Occa-

sionally, too, the altar may be needed for Exposition. These difficulties can, in fact, be overcome."

COMMEMORATION AT HIGH MASS

Question: The priests at our parish do not agree how the regulations of January 1, 1956, affect our High Masses. Do we make commemorations at daily sung High Masses? How about Sunday High Mass?

Answer: There are no commemorations at the ordinary daily sung (High) Mass. However, if there is an *oratio imperata* and the Mass of the day admits it, this must be included in the sung (High) Mass. On Sunday at the sung (High) Mass the same is true. However, if the Sunday is suppressed in favor of a greater feast, then the Sunday must be commemorated; e.g., on Sunday, Oct. 7, 1956, there was a commemoration of the twentieth Sunday after Pentecost but not of St. Mark.

SILVER WEDDING ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

Question: What sort of ceremony am I allowed to have for couples who are celebrating their silver wedding anniversary?

Answer: Fr. Philip Weller in his Ritual states that "there is no officially prescribed ritual of the Church for solemnizing an anniversary or marriage. Yet it is very much to be desired that Christ's faithful will honor such occasion, particularly the twenty-fifth and fiftieth jubilee, with some manner of religious observance in the house of their heavenly Father." He then gives a suggested ceremony which takes place in the sanctuary before Mass. It consists of the reading of Psalm 127, an allocution and prayer. He suggests that after the celebration of the Mass, the *Te Deum* be sung or recited.

DOMINICAN BLESSING OF ROSARIES

Question: Can I receive the faculty of blessing rosaries reserved to the Dominicans by applying to them for this permission?

Answer: In the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (1933, p. 170), we read that since April 1, 1933, "the generals and provincials of the Dominican order can no longer delegate this faculty to priests outside of the order; but those priests who had received this delegation prior to April 2, 1933, can still make use of it."

LIGHTING OF EASTER CANDLE

Question: Is there a set rule as to when the Easter Candle may be lighted (i.e., Low Masses, High Masses, etc.) on the days between Easter and Ascension?

Answer: The Easter candle should be lighted as follows:

(a) At High Mass on Easter Sunday and the two days following; on Saturday after Easter; on all Sundays up to Ascension Thursday;

(b) "On other days and solemnities during the paschal season the paschal candle may not be lighted except where there is an already established custom. On this condition therefore the candle may be lighted during the entire octave of Easter, on the anniversary of the Consecration of a church, during a low parochial Mass celebrated on Sundays."

(c) The candle may never be lighted at Requiems or at Masses celebrated with purple vestments.

(d) It should not be lighted during Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, except when it follows immediately after Mass or Vespers at which time the paschal candle was burning.

NUPTIAL BLESSING

Question: The nuptial blessing may not be given in a mixed marriage. May it be given later if the non-Catholic becomes a Catholic; may it be given in a Nuptial Mass offered, e.g., on the anniversary of the marriage?

Answer: The solemn nuptial blessing may be given and the nuptial Mass offered years after the marriage has been contracted. This often happens in the case of converts. It can be given at any suitable or convenient time. Caution should be taken that the

couple be informed that the blessing and Mass belong merely to the rite of the marriage ceremony and not to the substance and validity of the contract.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

THE *MISSA PRO POPULO* BY THE PASTOR OF A NATIONAL PARISH

Question: Since the pastors of territorial parishes are supposed to offer the Masses *pro populo* for all Catholics residing in their territory, can it be held that the pastor of a national church need not celebrate any Masses *pro populo* because his people are already the recipients of the benefits of some parochial Mass on every day assigned for such a Mass?

Answer: The pastor of a national parish, like the pastor of a territorial parish, has the obligation to offer the Masses *pro populo* on the assigned days—at least when he has geographical limits for the people of his particular nationality. Such is the statement of Fr. T. Donnellan, in his doctoral dissertation on the *Missa pro populo*: "National parishes, while their jurisdiction may cover the territory of several territorial parishes, are usually limited to a people speaking a certain language or of a certain nationality within a very definite geographical division. Pastors of national parishes with given geographical limits are certainly bound by the obligation of canon 466" (*The Obligation of the Missa pro populo* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942], p. 73). I would hesitate to admit the statement of the questioner, that the pastor of the territorial parish must include in the intenion of his Mass *all* Catholics residing within the limits of his parish. I believe that if the Bishop has taken certain persons from his care and assigned them to another (national) pastor, (at least if this latter has limits for his parish), the territorial pastor has no obligation to include them in his Masses *pro populo,* since this duty is fulfilled by the national pastor.

A PROBLEM IN COURTSHIP

Question: A priest finds that a young woman is keeping company with a man who was previously married and is now civilly divorced, but who has applied to ecclesiastical authorities for a declaration of nullity. May the young woman be allowed to continue the courtship?

Answer: Beyond doubt, if the reason which this man is adducing in the attempt to prove his previous marriage invalid is one that is doubtful, so that the outcome of the case is uncertain, the courtship must be broken off at once, and the young woman should be told that to continue would be a mortal sin. Such would be the case if the petition for a declaration of nullity is based on alleged lack of consent or on a claim of unjust fear in entering the union. A case of this kind is usually decided only after a long period of investigation, and even then the declaration may be a refusal of the petition for nullification. If the couple have been keeping company in the meantime, they are very likely to attempt a civil marriage because the ecclesiastical court seems too slow or because the response to the petition is unfavorable. Company-keeping in this situation is a serious occasion of sin and in itself is an act of scandal.

If the reason on which the man is basing his petition for a declaration of nullity is one that offers practical certainty of a favorable outcome—for example, the fact that the previous marriage of the man, a Catholic, took place before a civil magistrate—some might be inclined to judge the case more leniently and allow a girl to keep company with him even before the ecclesiastical court has given its decision. I cannot agree with this opinion, because I fear it offers an opening wedge to general laxity in this matter. I believe that company-keeping with a view to future marriage can be allowed only after the declaration of nullity has actually been given, no matter how evident the nullity of the previous marriage may appear.

THE PRESERVATION OF ALTAR BREADS

Question: A community of nuns in Holland bake altar breads, not only for priests in their own land but also for priests in foreign

lands. The hosts are enclosed in hermetically sealed cans to protect them against disintegration, and it is claimed that in this manner they can be kept fresh indefinitely. Indeed, the local Bishop testifies that these hosts are used in about 100 churches in Asia and Africa and are found fully satisfactory. Naturally, this means that at least several weeks, and perhaps several months intervene between the baking and the use of these altar breads. Some dealers in the United States are now wondering if these hosts could be put on sale in our country. Would this be conformable to the rules laid down by the Church and theologians regarding the length of time that may be permitted between the baking of altar breads and their use?

Answer: The law of the Church prescribes that the bread to be used for the Holy Eucharist must be "recently made, so that there is no danger of corruption" (Can. 815, §1). Moreover, decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, issued on Dec. 7, 1918, and on March 26, 1929, give detailed directions on this point (Cf. *AAS*, XI, 8; XXI, 631). The general rule is that it would be gravely illicit to use hosts that have been baked more than two months previously (Cf. Regatillo-Zalbo, *Theologiae moralis summa* [Madrid, 1954], III, nn. 162-63).

However, we now have a process whereby altar breads can be kept fresh and incorrupt for months or even for years, and the practical question arises whether they can be used after a long period of time if they have been preserved in this scientific manner. As far as the divine law is concerned, there is no difficulty about the validity and the lawfulness of the eucharistic consecration when such altar breads are used. There is a difficulty, however, from the standpoint of the ecclesiastical law, which (in the decree of 1918) very definitely condemns the use of hosts made two or three months previously. Nevertheless, I believe that by a reasonable interpretation of these Church laws, which supposed that the hosts were kept without any scientific measures for preserving them from corruption, we can hold that it is lawful to use hosts that have been preserved in the way described by the questioner, so that they are free from even the slightest sign of corruption. I recommend, however, that those who desire to promote the use of the altar breads kept for an indefinite period in this way propose the problem to the Holy See and obtain an authoritative answer. At

any rate, it should be emphasized that after these hosts have been taken from the container and consecrated at the Holy Sacrifice, they must not be kept too long, either for the communion of the faithful or for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament (Can. 1272).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

BAPTISM OF OFFSPRING FROM AN INVALID MARRIAGE

Question: May a priest baptize a child born of Catholic parents who are living in an invalid marriage?

Answer: A fundamental requirement for the baptism of an infant is that the parents or guardians desire the child to be baptized. They must, moreover, give convincing indications that the child will be reared as a Catholic and the priest must have moral certitude on this point before he is permitted to administer the sacrament. Canon 750 states that baptism may be conferred lawfully when one or both parents or legal guardians consent and proper provision is made for the Catholic education of the child. In answering this question two cases might be considered.

The first case to be considered is one where the invalid marriage can easily be validated without too great delay. If the parties are willing to validate the marriage and do so before the baptism, the priest will have every reason to believe the protestations of the parents or guardians that the child will be reared as a Catholic. Without hesitation he can baptize the child. On the other hand, if both parties are unreasonably unwilling that their marriage be validated, even though this can readily be done, or if the partners are indifferent on the matter, there are little or no grounds for moral certitude that the child will be reared as a Catholic if they continue to live together. Their deliberate persistence in remaining in a state of sin without reason seems to belie their promises with regard to the Catholic upbringing of the child.

The second type of invalid marriage wherein this problem can arise is the one where the partners are living in a union which cannot be validated either because of the existence of some impedi-

ment which cannot be removed or because one of the partners absolutely refuses to have the marriage validated. The important concern for the priest is that he have moral certitude that the child will be reared as a Catholic. If both partners sincerely assure him on this point, or if one partner can sufficiently assure him, the sacrament may be lawfully administered to the child. Such assurance is easily verified where the partners sincerely promise to provide for the Catholic education of the child and, at the same time, try themselves to live as closely as possible to the Church through the observance of those laws that they are able to observe.

PLANE TRAVELLERS AND CONFESSION

Question: Is it true that a priest who is travelling by plane is permitted to hear the confessions of fellow travellers in the course of the flight and, likewise, the confessions of other people who desire to confess at some airport along the way of flight?

Answer: This is true provided the conditions indicated in the *Motu proprio* of Pope Pius XII (Jan. 28, 1948—*AAS,* XL [1948], 17), are verified. In virtue of this document, the conditions of Canon 883 regarding a priest making an ocean journey are applied to air travel so that a priest who is actually making a journey by air and not merely sight-seeing or the like has jurisdiction for confessions. He must, however, possess faculties for hearing confessions from at least one of several local ordinaries, namely: from his own local ordinary; the local ordinary of the diocese in which the airfield of departure is situated; or, from the local ordinary of the diocese in which any airfield at which the plane lands en route is situated. It is to be noted that faculties from a local ordinary are necessary and, therefore, that faculties from the major superior of an exempt clerical institute are not sufficient. Even when the plane has stopped en route, he may hear the confessions of all who ask him during a period of not more than three days, if the local ordinary is available, and in this time the priest may even absolve from cases reserved to the local ordinary. In the event that the faculties should cease en route during an extended stop-over, they will revive again on resuming the journey, whether the journey be resumed in the same plane or in another plane.

SPIRITUAL DIRECTORS FOR RELIGIOUS

Question: Should every religious have a spiritual director?

Answer: It all depends upon what one means by a spiritual director. The local superior is in the mind of the Church a spiritual director with the obligation to lead souls committed to his or her care to sanctity according to the particular law of the institute. The ordinary confessor is also a spiritual director who should help souls along the road to perfection. Moreover, the Church has found it a practical necessity to commit young religious or aspirants to religious life to a special director, the master of novices or the master of the professed. Without these directors young religious or aspirants to religious life would find it very difficult to make progress in perfection. It is also permissible, but not necessary, to choose a spiritual director over and above these.

Older religious do not necessarily need a special spiritual director from whom they need continual direction and advice. It may be that they will feel the need for special counsel only at certain times. For example, as they progress in virtue, they may suffer great trials of painful aridity or may be in danger of falling into the defects of more advanced souls—hidden pride and presumption. On such occasions and especially at the time of the annual retreat the state of the soul can be made known to the director who more likely than not will also be the confessor.

In connection with the topic of spiritual direction it might be noted that many ascetical writers state that the director is usually a person in Holy Orders and that ordinary direction is that direction which is given in the confessional. They also observe that spiritual direction of women is normally given in the confessional while direction by correspondence is ordinarily not to be encouraged. These general observations of writers cannot, of course, cover every particular case. They do have a bearing upon the answer to this question, however, in so far as they indicate that the spiritual direction intended for religious should come in great measure from the confessor of the religious.

THE RIGHTS OF A RELIGIOUS TO CONFESS

Question: Must a religious superior permit a subject to leave the house every time the subject desires to go to confession?

Answer: It is presumed, of course, that this question does not apply to a monastery of cloistered nuns since such permission could not be allowed. Canons 519 and 522 provide for the peace of conscience of religious by permitting them to confess to any approved confessor whenever they sincerely desire to go to confession. Hence, granted the possibility of confessing in accordance with either of these canons, the religious may take advantage of the law. He or she has no right, however, to withdraw, for the sake of confession, from the regular discipline or from obedience to religious superiors. The religious superior, moreover, has the obligation to safeguard religious discipline in the house committed to his or her care. Accordingly, a superior may rightfully at times refuse permission to leave the religious house for the purpose of confession when such a request interferes with the general discipline of the house. Whether or not this course of action will be dictated will devolve upon the prudent judgment of the superior whose solicitude must embrace the good of the individual as well as the common good of the house.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

Analecta

The closing days of the summer may have signified vacation time for many people, but the numerous and varied talks of the Holy Father gave no indication whatsoever of a let-up in his busy schedule. Conventions in and about Rome, tourists, and special delegations were occasions for His Holiness to speak on many subjects.

On July 26 he spoke to representatives of a woman's organization for charitable activities, the National Federation of Patronages of Belgium. He exhorted them to fight against "a hostile world penetrated by paganism" and remain faithful to their dignity as Christians by being militant children of God and of the Church. On the following day His Holiness received Paul Heymans in regard to the World Exhibition to be held in Brussels in 1958. The Pope made clear to him as the Commissioner General for the Holy See at the exhibition that he expected Catholics throughout the world to support the Catholic pavilion to be erected at the World Exhibit there. The Vatican exhibit is planned to give a world-wide view of Catholicism and for this purpose an appeal for funds from Catholics all over the world will be necessary. A few days later, July 30, Belgians were again the recipients of words of encouragement from the Pope. He received a group of Belgian youths representing the National Federation of Orators on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization. Urging them to remain true to the spirit of their founder, he defined that spirit as "the spirit of prayer, obedience, and mortification, the only spirit capable of overcoming the obstacles of the world which are imbued with materialism and sensuality."

Cardinal Tedeschini, Archpriest of the Vatican Basilica, observed the sixtieth anniversary of his ordination and received the congratulations and good wishes of the Holy Father on July 30.

In 1718 Pope Clement XI founded the Pontifical Academy of Roman Theology. The present Pope reactivated this academy by pontifical decree. Formerly there were forty members in the acad-

emy, priests who were widely esteemed for their theological knowledge. In addition to these ordinary members, twenty of whom are selected from Rome, "correspondent members" can now be nominated to the academy. The academy supervises the publication of theological documents and seeks to increase theological studies.

At Loyola, Spain, an overflow congregation gathered in the Basilica of St. Ignatius on August 3 in order to mark the close of the Ignatian year. The Ignatian year had been proclaimed to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the death of St. Ignatius. The Holy Father spoke to the congregation by radio and said that St. Ignatius was not only an "honor" to his fatherland, but also "to humanity and to the Church." He described the Saint as a man who loved Christ to an utmost degree. He was in truth, said the Pope, modest, humble, and indissolubly united with God.

On August 11 the Pope sent a message of comfort and a pledge of material aid to families mourning the victims of the mine disaster in Belgium. On the same day he received a delegation of disabled war veterans during a convention for veterans in Rome and he encouraged them in their afflictions to entrust their lives to Almighty God.

In August a new Auditor for the Sacred Roman Rota, the Very Rev. Werner Ewers, was appointed by the Holy Father. Father Ewers is the second German Auditor on the Rota which now has eighteen active members of the following nationalities: two French; two Spanish; one English; one Polish; eight Italians; and two from the United States.

As he has done in former years, the Pope led a radio recitation of the *Angelus* on the feast of the Assumption. A month before the broadcast, His Holiness reminded Catholics behind the Iron Curtain to pray God to ward off the dangers threatening them and the world. Five centuries previously, he said, another Pope, Pope Callistus III, had issued his "Bull of Prayers" asking the faithful to pray the *Angelus* in order to halt the advances of the Turks in southeastern Europe.

The early days of September marked a period of various discourses for the Holy Father on matters ranging from dietetics to international economy. Delegates of the Second International Congress on Dietetics were received by the Pope and heard that the Church is vitally interested in their work, not only because of

its humanitarian importance, but also because of the spiritual value to be derived from proper nutrition. Spiritual welfare thrives where health is adequately provided with proper necessities. Speaking to delegates of the first congress of the International Economic Association, the Holy Father pointed to the increasing importance of the role of the economist in the world today. He appealed to economists to consider spiritual values as an integral part of world economic problems. Stability and progress in the world economy, he said, are endangered by the great lack of balance between nations in material wealth. The poorer nations, he continued, realize their needs and sometimes seek to achieve them through violence with consequent threats to international peace. Accordingly, the Pope emphasized the great responsibility of the economist to solve such problems. Systems such as absolute capitalism or Marxism are in conflict with reality and mark extremes in economic theories. The word and example of Christ, concluded the Holy Father, teach a "curbing of the instinct which is inclined toward unbridled pleasure in the riches of nature. It teaches preference for poverty as a means of attaining personal freedom and performing social service."

In a radio address to the Seventh International Congress of Doctors meeting at The Hague, the Pope told them to study the Ten Commandments to find moral standards governing medical activity. The Pope warned that medical law cannot countenance anything contrary to the moral law, e.g., euthanasia or abortion. Even if civil law may countenance such acts, the physician must realize his obligation to the law of God. He then discussed the physician's obligation to inform his conscience on God's laws and to act according to objective norms given by God. The Pope also called for international cooperation to further medical research along lines in keeping with the teachings of the Church. The Catholic physician, he said, has no special medical knowledge because he is a Catholic but he does have a special point of view from which to consider the problems of his profession. The Catholic physician should, therefore, exert a positive influence on his environment, especially when he works in non-Catholic surroundings.

In a letter to the Carthusian monks of the Monastery of Vedana at Mas di Sedico, Italy, during the observance of the fifth centenary of the monastery, the Holy Father praised the contem-

plative life which should be one of work and prayer. If contemplatives, he said, cannot dedicate themselves to the external works of the apostolate, they can nevertheless contribute to it by their example in the practice of virtues, and by their study of the sacred sciences. Contemplatives, he continued, are like Moses who retained victory for his people over their enemies just as long as he stood with his hands raised in prayer.

In a letter to Cardinal Pizzardo, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, on the occasion of a meeting of the directors of Italian seminaries in Rome, the Holy Father said that spiritual direction is an art which requires exact preparation and constant attention. He stressed the difficulties, the grave responsibilities and the norms to be followed by spiritual directors, particularly directors of seminarians who must develop an esteem for the interior life and the observance of ecclesiastical discipline.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.Carm.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

ALL OR NOTHING. By Murray Ballantyne. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. Pp. viii + 216. $3.50.

All or Nothing is Murray Ballantyne's story of his conversion to the Catholic Faith in 1933 when he was twenty-four years old, with some added reflections on his subsequent life within the Church. Since Mr. Ballantyne writes with an easy clarity and is evidently gifted with considerable power of introspection, his story is an engrossing account of the strong and patient ways of God with a soul He has called to be one with Him in His Mystical Body on earth.

The author was born and grew to manhood in the stoutly Protestant, self-sufficient, and graciously self-assured society of the great houses clustered around Mount Royal—a society almost completely insulated from the French Canadian Catholic people of Montreal, and to a great extent also from the smaller group of Catholics of English-speaking descent. His own family was Presbyterian—more as a matter of Scottish heritage, apparently, than of any particular definite dogmatic beliefs—and he has warm memories of the religious observances and instruction that marked his childhood days. Even as a child, he recalls, he had a passion for logic and logical consequences, and an absorbed interest in questions of absolute destiny and human purpose; a passion and interest that were to sustain him through some years of incipient agnosticism and youthful semi-atheism and lead him finally, under God's grace, to the Catholic Church.

All convert biographies are the same and yet different: the same in that they relate the workings of God's internal and external graces leading a man or woman to what Belloc called "the natural home of the Human Spirit"; different as human beings are different, as environments, temperaments, minds and wills and emotions are different and hence differently moved and attracted with the exquisite understanding of the God who knows us better than we know ourselves. Even those who have read a great many stories of conversion will find *All or Nothing* inspiring and valuable as a fresh and moving illustration of the infinite variety of God's ways with human souls.

Murray Ballantyne felt the warm spiritual reality of the Catholic Church and was moved and impressed by it before he had any explicit adult belief in the reality of God. He was led from the existence of

the Church to the existence of God; and in chapter fifteen he gives an interesting account of the negative process of reasoning that convinced him of God's existence after he had failed to grasp the cogency of the positive approach. He "decided to have a look at the difficulties of unbelief" (p. 132), and found them far harder to surmount than the difficulties of belief.

All or Nothing contains passages of genuine eloquence, notably the author's account of the climax of the "obscure development" of his conversion process (pp. 85-86), and his description of the holiness of the Church (pp. 125-26). He acknowledges his debt to Chesterton, and indeed occasionally pays to the distinguished English convert the compliment of writing—perhaps without meaning to—very much (and very competently) in the Chestertonian style: witness, for example, the opening paragraphs of chapter nine.

Mr. Ballantyne's book, incidentally, documents rather well one of the hazards a convert faces in his entry into the Church. The convert is aware, of course, that the Church he has found is the *Catholic* Church, truly *universal,* but he is not always prepared for the full impact of its universality. Psychologically this is easy to explain. A great many Protestant congregations are relatively homogeneous; not in doctrine, usually (which is not considered too important), but in tastes, social outlook, and social and economic position of the members. The Protestant is very much at home with his "own sort" of people. Then, by the divine vocation that is conversion, God calls a man from his Protestant congregation into the Catholic Church. The convert finds, in his study of Catholicism, the answer to his hopes and ideals and desires. Since the Church's appeal is universal, each convert finds, paradoxically enough, that it has a *particular* appeal to *him;* and the danger is that he might subconsciously and obscurely expect to find in the Church only—or largely—people like himself, with his tastes, his temperament, his likes and dislikes. Of course he really finds that there are Catholics, good Catholics, with views on, say, music, church architecture, devotional reading, and so on, radically different from his own. The convert also finds that not all Catholics are saints, that not all ecclesiastics are models of humility and self-effacement, that not all Catholic services or all Catholic churches are perfect examples of austere beauty. The convert finds, in short, that, just because the Church *is* universal, it contains a great many people unlike him. He finds also that the Church is not a social club of "good people" but the vast earthly militant Body in which saints find their inspiration and fulfillment and in which sinners find the solace and sacramental strength to sustain them in the arduous struggle to work out their salvation.

These observations are prompted by Murray Ballantyne's chapter nineteen, in which he relates some of the disappointments he found—not in the Church itself, he makes abundantly clear—but in the all-too-human failings of some of his fellow Catholics. There is just a faint note of surprise detectable in this chapter that such failings should exist. One cannot help but feel, however regretfully, that Murray Ballantyne is a little hasty and perhaps a trifle supercilious in some of his judgments. It might be just possible that at times he has misunderstood some of his fellow Catholics and failed to make the allowances for them that he has every right to expect them to make for him.

But the author has made his own thoroughly Catholic comment on his chapter nineteen when he ends it with the following words: "Always, despite our human failings, [the Church] is beautiful as a bride and terrible as an army with banners. And if she appears to fail, is the fault not mine, for am I not a cell in her body? We are all members of one another. If I gain merit, she is strengthened. If I sin, she is weakened. I will not blame the Church, I will blame only myself. Holy Mother Church, I love you, make me worthy of your membership" (p. 189).

EDMOND D. BENARD

THE MIND OF THE CHURCH IN THE FORMATION OF SISTERS. Edited by Sister Rita Mary, C.H.M. New York: Fordham University Press, 1956. Pp. 282. $3.00.

On Sept. 13, 1951, Pope Pius XII in addressing the First International Congress of Teaching Sisters pointed out to them the need to know how to adapt themselves to new conditions preserving always those values that do not permit any change. "You," he said, "must serve the cause of Jesus Christ and of His Church as the world of today requires." The following April the Teacher Education Section of the National Catholic Education Association met in Kansas City to discuss some of the important implications of the Holy Father's recommendations. In doing so they planted the seed for the later foundation and providential growth of the Sister-Formation Conferences under whose auspices this remarkable and significant volume is presented.

The sole purpose of the Sister-Formation Conferences is to further the wishes of the Holy Father in regard to the complete preparation—spiritual, intellectual and professional—of Sisters in order that their own religious life may be more solid and more fruitful. The Conferences contained in this volume were originally presented at twelve

meetings in key cities throughout the United States during the period from November 1954 to January 1955. A total of 246 religious communities and 70 general or provincial superiors participated in these meetings, sponsored in every case by the Ordinary of the diocese in which they were held. A glance at the distinguished contributors in the table of contents reveals a patient effort to construct Sister formation policy out of the best thinking on Sister preparation and other analogous points on the part of bishops, canonists, superintendents of schools, priest educators in colleges and universities and of those charged with the formation of religious men.

The Sisters responsible for the organization of these conferences have wisely based their planning on the centuries of experience embodied in important ecclesiastical directives and in the actual practices of the larger orders of religious men. Those in charge of seminary formation and of the training of young men religious will find the excellent compilation of current practices particularly timely and interesting. In a sense all priests will derive a sympathetic and broader understanding of the problems faced particularly by the teaching Sisterhoods who are valiantly trying to solve the dilemma created by their desire to meet the urgent requests of pastors for more and more Sisters for their schools and their conviction that their young subjects require a longer period of spiritual, intellectual and professional formation. Because of its noble objective to deepen and strengthen the complete life of the young religious in her formative years, the Sister-Formation movement holds tremendous promise of increasing vocations and making possible an extension and a flowering of the works of mercy. A short delay in putting Sisters through deepened and lengthened programs of spiritual and intellectual formation will be more than off-set by the great impetus given to the works of the Church through these spiritually and professionally competent women.

Since active orders of teaching, nursing and social work Sisters are still a comparatively new phenomenon in the life of the Church, it is not unreasonable to expect, that as time goes on, more definite ecclesiastical directives will be issued concerning the formation of these religious on whose work the success of the Church's mission seems to depend so intimately. It is indeed a very healthy sign that conferences such as are reported in this volume are calmly and objectively exploring the problems and policies on which the more definite programs of the future will surely be based.

Despite its tremendous and notable accomplishments in successfully organizing twenty regional Conferences in the short space of two years, the Sister-Formation Conference, directed by the indefatigable Sister

M. Emil, I.H.M., and her able and tireless associates, is still busily at work planning programs designed to re-enforce and strengthen the remarkable interest evinced by both clergy and Sisterhoods in this movement. In the fall of 1955 the Sister-Formation Conference held its second series of meetings on the theme: "The Integration of Spiritual and Intellectual Elements in the Formation of Sisters." The publication of this second volume of Proceedings which is contemplated in the near future will be a valuable addition to the growing literature in this field and a real contribution to the solution of the problem of how to train Sisters for professed life in which personal spirituality and the work of the apostolate will not seem to be opposed and somewhat irreconcilable aims. Aided by a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education, fifteen eminent Sister educators, together with a number of nationally known educators as consultants, have recently completed a three-month curriculum workshop held to devise better methods in collegiate teacher training and preprofessional education for Sister nurses and social workers. Their findings and recommendations will be presented in the third series of regional conferences to be held in the late fall.

The real work of the Sister-Formation Conference has according to Sister Mary Emil hardly been begun. "It will be on its way," she says, "when we have adequate professional pre-service training for all Sister teachers, nurses and social workers, when the juniorate program has developed to a point at which we can say that it represents the spiritual flowering of the novitiate training and parallels spiritually the intellectual enrichment of the pre-service college program, when we have made an honest and completely realistic appraisal of the difficulties experienced by the Sister in service to continue or complete her professional training, to continue to nourish her spiritual life with solid, dogmatic and ascetical truths, to keep up with current events and thought, and to acquire and maintain a modicum of general culture. At that point we may begin to think of what an influence 154,000 Sisters could be in the spiritual, intellectual and apostolic life of the Church and of our nation."

JOHN J. VOIGHT

THEY SAW HIS GLORY. An Introduction to the Gospel and Acts. By Maisie Ward. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. Pp. 278. $4.50.

This introduction wastes no space "proving" authenticity and early dates; it bothers not at all to refute the critics. After 52 pages of

necessary information on historical background (which includes three good pages on the Qumran Essenes), authorship, the synoptic problem, transmission of the text, and inspiration, it treats each of the synoptic Gospels, then *Acts,* and finally *John.* This order corresponds to historical reality because the fourth Gospel, though it utilizes facts and in some ways shows a better sense of history than the synoptics, is really a theology that reflects also the thought of the Church in the period after the destruction of Jerusalem. Similar considerations might have induced the author to treat *Mark* first; it certainly is prior to the Greek *Matthew,* which is the only *Matthew* that has survived.

In the discussion of the individual books we are no longer reading about them; we are reading the book, with Maisie Ward as guide, pointing out its characteristic features and contributions, explaining difficult passages where clarification is needed to see the whole development, showing how its message is unfolded. The information given to the reader is derived from the best authorities: Albright, Lagrange, Prat, Bonsirven, Alexander Jones, Vincent Taylor, Ramsay, the contributors to the *Catholic Commentary* and to the unsurpassed *Bible ... de Jérusalem* are some of the names cited repeatedly. Yet, this is not patchwork; the author's personal contribution stands out not only in unity of purpose and execution, but also in a contagious enthusiasm that carries the reader along and in many precious insights into the inspired pages that are derived from personal meditation and from practical use of the Bible in Catholic Evidence Guild Work. *They Saw His Glory* will have you reaching for your New Testament and finding in it delights and treasures that you missed before. The reader who insists on being convinced by a personal test should turn to pp. 73-85, "The Last Great Discourse" (*Matthew* cc. 24-25, whence the Gospel for the last Sunday of the church year is taken). The discourse cannot be understood without reading it against the background of apocalyptic; the author's reconstruction of that background from pertinent Old Testament texts is masterful.

A surprising and unfortunate omission from this excellent work is a chapter on the oral catechesis, "the Gospel before the Gospels," the prehistory of our written Gospels in the decades between 30 and 60, which was decisive for their formation and which throws bright light on their meaning, as the Form Critics have shown. The *Bible ... de Jérusalem* (p. 1284) has a succinct and enlightening treatment, but the *Catholic Commentary* (§609) omits any reference to the positive contributions of Form Criticism. I regret that the CCD translation was not used; it would have made the Old Testament citations so much more intelligible, and also made sense out of the muddled Douai translation of *John* 21, 22 (pp. 222 f.; the correct translation

is found on p. 270). If a companion volume on the rest of the New Testament is written—I hope it will be—it would be tragic to use the hopelessly inadequate Rheims-Douai in the Pauline Epistles! I am confident that the companion volume will not propose the view that *Galatians* is the first of St. Paul's Epistles (p. 204) and will allow for the pseudonymity of *2 Peter* (p. 205). The best recent scholarship will not bear out the author's confidence that "Christ advanced His 'hour' in answer to His mother's unspoken prayer" (p. 265), since most probably "hour" in *John* 2, 4 as elsewhere in the Gospel means the hour of Jesus' death and glorification.

EDWARD F. SIEGMAN, C.PP.S.

NEGLECTED SAINTS. By E. I. Watkin. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955. Pp. xiii + 241. $3.50.

E. I. Watkin, lamenting the fact that for the majority of Catholics "the vast wealth of the Communion of Saints has no existence," attempts to remedy this somewhat by his book *Neglected Saints.* He presents us with the portraits of four Saints, and five Beati whose lives are little known but indeed worthy of investigation and study. It is the author's intention in these short sketches (with the exception of two rather long ones, the average life is about twenty pages) "to paint a true and lifelike picture." His subjects represent a cross-section of the Church and include three bishops, several members of religious orders, and one lay woman. Thus we see that the following are treated: St. Martin of Tours, St. Bruno, St. Hugh of Lincoln, St. Thomas of Villanueva, Blessed John of Montmirail, Blessed Jordan and Blessed Diana, Blessed Osanna of Mantua, and finally Blessed Anthony Grassi.

The author has used original sources when they were available, and so he refers to Sulpicius Severus' life of St. Martin, Adam's *Magna Vita* of St. Hugh, and Salon's biography of St. Thomas. Often excerpts from letters are quoted which give a penetrating insight into the actual character of the person described. This is especially true in the life of Blessed Jordan. Though at times a rather careless order and an over-emphasis on *minutiae* are annoying, the book on the whole is interesting and readable.

One cannot help noticing, even in a cursory reading of the book, the author's preoccupation on the validity of miracles and mystical phenomena. He is always careful to note his own opinion on the authenticity of these facts. In the postscript, Mr. Watkins explains that the "'recent change in our view of the natural law" must be taken into account. Telekenesis, precognition, and clairvoyance, he feels, might